(SRI S. R. RAMIAH)

(*b*) the number of sandal trees made use of every year by the Sandal Oil Factory;

(*c*) the number of sandal trees disposed off to others every year;

(*d*) the number of such trees which existed in Hoskote and Devanahalli Talukas during the last five years (figures for each year to be furnished separately)?

A.—SRI H. S. RUDRAPPA (Minister for Agriculture).—

(*a*) No. Enumeration has been made.

(*b*) About 1,200 to 1,300 tons of prepared wood. No record of the number of trees exploited to make up this quantity is kept.

(*c*) About 300 to 350 tons. No record of the number of trees exploited to make up this quantity is kept.

(*d*) No enumeration has been made.

---

2 P.M.

DEMANDS FOR ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1957-58.

(Debate continued)

DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—Sir, among the various demands that have been asked for under these Supplementary Estimates for the year 1957–58, there are some on which I would like to have information from the Government. Under Demand No. 2 an amount of Rs. 3,34,000 has been asked for. This Demand refers to the question of remuneration of Shanbhogs and Patels. The question of fixation of the remuneration of the Shanbhogs and Patels of Sandur Taluk has been before the Government for quite a long time. These people have been asking for fixing their remuneration on the same basis as in the old Madras area to which they belonged after the merger of the Sandur State to Madras. This question has not yet been settled and it is causing a considerable amount of trouble.

Under Demand No. 7 a token grant of Rs. 100 has been asked for. On the 1st of January of this year new rates of taxes were levied on the motor vehicles. The notice that was issued to the operators did not give enough time to the operators to pay the amount. A grace period of 15 days was given, but even that also was not sufficient for them and so a request has been made for refund of the penalty that was levied on them. In this regard I wish to bring to the notice of the Government that the inter-State bus operators, namely, operators operating between two States, for instance between Mysore and Andhra or between Mysore and Madras, are having a considerable amount of difficulties. They have got to pay a huge amount as licence fee because there are no reciprocal arrangements with the Governments of Andhra or Madras. This matter should be attended to at a very early date. Under Demand No 8, a certain amount has been asked for for the Office of the Commissioner of Sales Tax. In this connection I wish to state that people who are purchasing sugar are required to pay sales-tax even on the excise duty that is levied on sugar by the Government of India. During previous years this was not being collected and I understand that it is the intention of the Government not to collect this, but orders have not been issued as yet to this effect and so it is causing considerable trouble.

Under Demand No. 10 money has been asked for irrigation works. We in Hospet Taluk have been asking for repairs to the old Bella anicut built by the Vizainagar Kings, but nothing has so far been done for that. I find that under this Demand a sum of Rs. 20 lakhs has been asked for. I request that a small portion from this amount may be used for repairing the old anicut in our Taluk.

Under Demand No. 18 a sum of Rs. 68,000 has been asked for. It is well known that in our Sandur mines we have very valuable deposits of manganese and iron ore. Probably there we have got one of the best deposits in the world. Recently

negotiations have been going on with the Government of Japan for exporting large quantities of iron ore to that country. The quantity mentioned is about 70 to 80 lakh tons during the next two years. For exporting this to Japan we would require a good port on the West Coast which is near Bellary. I think Karwar or Bhatkal would be most convenient, and I understand that Karwar port is proposed to be used for this purpose. A good sum of money will be required for making suitable arrangements at Karwar port.

The question of improving the port would also include the question of connecting the port with a railway line. Unfortunately, Karwar port is not connected by any railway line at all. The Britishers connected Murmagoa with Hubli and even Maslipatam port on the east coast with the railway line, but now we do not have the use of Marmagoa port for the present. So I think it would be very necessary for this Government to address the Government of India to connect Karwar port with a railway line so as to facilitate our export.

Under Demand No. 19 a small amount of Rs. 1,000 has been asked for. It is stated in the Explanatory Note that the scheme of the reorganisation of the Department of Mines and Geology was sanctioned as far back as November 1957 and a sum of Rs. 2,14,618 also was sanctioned for the purpose. Under this Demand, only a small amount of Rs. 1,000 has been asked for. Five months have already passed after the scheme was sanctioned and no amount has so far been spent. This is indeed very unfortunate. When we are very busy with development works I cannot understand how a period of five months should have passed without any expenditure on development and reorganisation of the Department of Mines and Geology. This is a Department which earns for us valuable foreign exchange and so I hope they would spend the necessary amount very early and develop this department.

Under Demand No. 20, it is stated in the Explanatory Note that the University of Mysore has been asking for Rs. 16 lakhs. As has been mentioned in the explanatory note is this sum to meet the extra amount required for paying higher salaries granted to the University staff, especially the Lecturers who are under-paid. But Government says that it is going to pay only Rs. 10 lakhs. This would not enable the Mysore University to meet the extra cost on account of this single item and I do not know wherefrom the University would be able to get the extra money required. I hope Government will see its way to make provision for this.

Under Demand No. 24, a sum of Rs. 12 lakhs has been asked for. I hope that under the Welfare Scheme for Scheduled Castes, the question of giving for grant building houses for the Scheduled Castes in my District would be taken up.

There is only one more Demand in respect of which I wish to make a suggestion to Government.

Recently Bangalore has developed a scheme in which supply of milk has been recently reorganised. But no increase in the supply of milk has been attempted. I would like to make a suggestion. The Hessaraghatta Farm has been supplying a certain quantity of milk to Hospitals. Hessaraghatta has a number of facilities for developing the dairy industry. I would suggest in the first instance that the number of she-buffaloes and cows that the Government has been keeping at this place may be increased as a first step towards ensuring a proper amount of milk supply to Bangalore City.

Under Demand No. 29—Roads and Bridges, certain moneys are asked for repairing roads and bridges. In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works that we in Hospet are very badly in need of roads in the sugarcane area. I brought this point to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister last year also and nothing has been done till now. I wish to say that the money that is already collected there under the sugarcane cess fund has to be utilised for this. This money has been collected

(DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA)

only with a view to provide roads and communication facilities in that area. Government seem to have some difficulty in making use of this money. A separate fund should have been created for this purpose and I request that Government may bring for the a Bill in this behalf and create a separate fund as quickly as possible.

Under bridges, I have got to mention one point. Before Bellary was added to Mysore, the trunk road from Madras to Bombay was through Harapanahalli and Harihar; and this was kept in a very good condition. Two years ago, a bridge collapsed near Teligi between Harapanahalli and Harihar. These two years, it has not been repaired and I cannot see even now. Any arrangement for repairing that bridge. I would very earnestly request that this bridge be repaired before the monsoon begins.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—What is that bridge ?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Bridge near TELGI. It is on the road from Bellary to Shimoga. There is a very large number of buses plying on that route. That is the road connecting Chitaldrug District and Bellary District. It is a very small bridge and it has not been taken care of these two years.

One thing. There are two more bridges near the 30th mile which have not been attended to. I hope they will attend to them very quickly.

Sir, one thing more and I am finished. That is Demand No. 38. I must congratulate the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture for asking this sum of Rs. 5,000. It is a very small amount, but it is for a wonderful purpose, that is growing grass in grazing lands. I am glad, he is thinking of encouraging the growing of grass in gomal lands and other places.

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA (Minister for Agriculture).—I have not asked for that grant. The Hon'ble Minister for Revenue has asked for that grant, Sir.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—The Revenue Minister might have asked for this money. But it is the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture who will make use of the money. I only say that this amount is a token amount and hope this experiment will prove successful and that the Government will be able to spend more money on this item. There is a great need for it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I would like to make one general observation before I speak on the particular Demands. I refer to this expression 'new service' which has nowhere been defined and this expression appears in a number of Demands. I should like the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Debate to kindly tell me what exactly is meant by this term.

Sir, I must at the outset say that the observations made on previous occasions in respect of supplementary Demands in previous years seem to have been ignored by the way in which the supplementary Demands are placed before the House on the present occasion. I refer to item No. 2. Here is a Demand for Rs. 3,34,000 relating to the payment of Potgi to Shanbhogues. I hope the term Kunnungo also refers to Shanbhogues and Patels. Sir, I am glad that after all we have been able to get the meaning of the word.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—No, it is not correct, Sir. It was made clear even the day before yesterday.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—After an hour or so, Sir. Sir, it is very difficult to imagine that this payment to the Shanbhogues who render work in the rural areas, should not have been foreseen at the time of framing the Budget. A thing like that does not reflect very much credit either to those in charge of the administration or more particularly to those in charge of the Finance Department. It is a fairly big sum. There is a lot of complaint from the Patels and Shanbhogues that they are not paid properly and regularly. On the other hand, there is a lot of arrears pending in the Revenue Department. Whether these amounts were held up for want of

recovery in time as a penal measure against the Shanbhogues is not very clear.

Sri M. P. PATIL (Minister for Revenue).—It is not held up, Sir. The excess amount has to be met and therefore the supplementary Demand has to be placed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—When the Budget provision is made, why the payments in respect of shanbhogues and patels could not be foreseen this cannot be an item of unforeseen expenditure. These Shanubhogues have been employed and they have been doing work and the amount of potgi payable to them should have been foreseen.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, the allowances were increased by the Government after the last Budget.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, there is no mention of that in the explanatory note. My objection is that if only there had been a note to the effect that this increased expenditure is on account of enhancement of the scale of potgi, then I would not have raised this objection. If that is the reason, I am accepting that statement of the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I am here to give the necessary explanation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am glad, Sir. in future before presenting the supplementary statement before this House, full reasons may perhaps be explained in order to avoid this kind of comment.

Sir, in regard to item 5, there is bad English. But I will not refer to it. 'Sandalwood purchases and regeneration, etc'. I am only saying that it is bad English. Possibly it is not a serious matter. It is stated in the explanatory note:

> The additional grant is in view of the necessity to supply larger quantities of Sandalwood to the Sandaloil Factory.

Sir, here is a case of an industrial concern not knowing what it is doing. It must place its demands on the basis of previous year's average. It looks as though this particular concern is functioning without a purpose and without any plan and without any targets. It passes my comprehension to think that in the middle of the year, this concern has been put to the necessity of asking for a lakh of rupees worth of Sandalwood the plea that there is higher demand. This does not convince anybody. The demand cannot suddenly shoot up. Not is it very difficult to have anticipated the demand from the potential or regular buyers.

Demand No. 8. So far as the Sales Tax Department Reorganisation is concerned, I am glad that the Hon'ble Minister has been able to make provision for the reorganisation of the Department.

In respect of the staff I do not know why we are depending upon the same old method of recruitment for the Sales Tax Department. There is a persistent hue and cry on the behalf of the public that these officers do not know A.B.C. of sales tax business either in the matter of recovery or in the manner in which it has to be administration. They do not give any clarification to the people who are victimised. That is the standing complaint. Even after reorganisation they do not institute a system of of training of officers to be appointed in this department. I am afraid this discontent will continue and it will perhaps be accentuated in the coming months. I hope Government will take note of this and see that a scheme of training is evolved for officers who are being recruited for this Department. The habit of posting anybody and everybody irrespective of considerations of compelence and aptitude and even merit. This I think, must be put an end to immediately. Otherwise, the Government stands discredited, the public will feel inconvenienced and even the collection of sales tax arrears might perhaps suffer.

In regard to Demand 10, irrigation there is a very big demand of Rs. 20 lakhs made under repairs. Here is a case in which it is very difficult to assess the tangible results. This is a very fertile source of making money for departmental people in the interior. In the name of repairing tanks they will not put in the maximum effort either by way of human energy or by way of

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

spending the last pie allotted for this purpose. My personal experience in respect of a few tanks in my own constituency is there. There has been merely an apologia for repair and at the end of it there is not even a kind of technical audit. In a large majority of cases this amount is wasted. On this particular occasion I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works to the fact that in previous years—I won't call it the regime of the Bureaucratic Government, even in the regime of the popular Government the healthy system of asking the villagers to continues voluntary labour in respect of maintaining tanks was in vogue. Latterly, every villager seems to think that it is the responsibility of the Government. I think we are losing the initiative and responsibility on the part of the villagers. I am sure the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works will kindly see that scope is given for local initiative and responsibility is enforced so that villagers may contribute their share of labour. Otherwise, the Government may provide two millions of rupees annualy, and still it may be impossible to repair all the tanks. This aspect is important especially in view of the fact that the Hon'ble Minister states that extensive repair works have to be undertaken as many of the tanks have been damaged as a result of rains. The explanatory note says that 'an outlay of Rs. 25,91,343 according to Departmental figures has already been booked up to the end of November 1957. My objection is that there is no reason why any Department should exceed the estimates. If the argument is that money has already been spent, I do not know how between March and July or August or September any tank repairs can be undertaken.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Some of this expenditure relates to repair works on account of damages as a result of heavy rains. Some of those works, for instance, bridges, roads and even certain tanks, could not actually wait. Therefore, without waiting for estimates being prepared and sanction being obtained, the Government ordered that these urgent works should be taken up immediately. Therefore, some of this expenditure has been incurred.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is exactly why I have put forward my objection. Even without preparing estimates, if works involving lakhs of rupees are taken up, you will see how the ratepayers' money is being wreeklessly spent. It is not as if I disbelieve any particular officers. I think it is bad in principle. We have got to be very vigilant even if it is an item involving only a hundred rupees if it concerns the ratepayer's money.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—May I explain further? That has to be done under certain circumstances. For instance, when tanks are breached, unless ring bunds, are put up water is consumed and made available for standing crops, we will not be discharging our duty. Under such circumstances any officer and any Department cannot wait for sanction, because all the water will be depleted. Therefore, under certain circumstances it is very necessary that works should be taken up before estimates are even prepared.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I may be credited with some experience in the matter of repairs to tanks and the patch work that is done in cases of emergency. The demand asked for is of the order of Rs. 22 lakhs for putting up ordinary ring bund. I am afraid the Public Works Department should not spend money like that.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I may tell him that it is not the ordinary repair of one tank or two tanks. In Kolar District itself 113 tanks have been breached. Therefore, huge works involving a large amount of money had to be undertaken. Therefore, they had to be taken up immediately in order to save standing crops. So simultaneonsly estimates were being prepared and the work was also executed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I only wish to emphasise one fact and that is that the Hon'ble Minister and the officers concerned will have to investigate the possibility of enlisting the

contribution of labour from the villagers which to a great extent will minimise the expenditure on the State Exchequer. In fact, it is an age-old practice. I know that with prefer approach it is not always possible to expect assistance from the villagers. I am afraid that this wholesome practice has been given up now. I would invite the attention of the House to the fact that we are in a popular Government and we are ruled by a majority party which talks so and so frequently much about public co-operation. Even for urgent repairs relating to village tanks if they cannot enlist the co-operation of the villagers, it is a sad commentary on the administration headed by popular Ministers. My only point is that in spending this money it is better to allocate responsibility in a fixed proportion, however small it may be, on the villagers.

In regard to Demand 13, it is very good that the Government have thought of bringing up the Gazetteer in this State. Possibly the Government are not aware that the Census Commissioner was previously in charge of the work of this Gazetteer and as it is there are a number of District Gazetteers prepared by the Census Department.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Was it during the Hon'ble Member's regime ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Yes. I am not objecting to the Government appointing a particular officer because the present officer in charge of this work is one with a lot of talent of this kind of work. What I want to submit is that this expenditure could have been avoided.

When the Census Commissioner's Office is continued and when he has been doing this work, why should this work have been taken away from him and a separate officer should have been appointed ? I cannot understand that. It is open to Government to see if it is not possible to tag on this work to the Census Commissioner as the actual work in connection with census begins only two years prior to the taking of census. Till then I do not think the Census Commissioner has sufficient work to do and it would have been very much better in the interest of work because it was only the continuation of past effort for the Census Department. Even now the Government may kindly look into this matter. Another important matter is what is the period for which the Chief Editor of this Gazetteer is going to be appointed ? None of the details are forthcoming. I know the practice of the various States which undertook this work.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—To begin with, he will be appointed for 3 years.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is the experience of various States in India that such temporary establishments which were first fixed at 3 years have continued for 10 years. It was in view of this that on an All-India basis the Government of India in the Home Department suggested that the work of compilation of the of the Gazetteer should be entrusted to the Census Commissioner. For the first time in 1951 this work was entrusted to the Census Commissioner. Even now the Government may investigate into this matter and see if this expenditure can be avoided.

Coming to Demand 18, in regard to port development they have given details regarding four or five items. The item 'Other Charges' account for Rs. 60,600. It would have been very much better when supplementary Demands are placed before the House for its sanction if details are furnished. I do not know what it refers to. It is not clear whether it refers to the pay of officers or pay of establishment or T.A. or D.A. or contingencies.

2-39 P.M.

This sum of Rs. 1,68,000 is a heavy amount and more than 60 per cent is not accounted for or spent.

Coming to Demand No. 20, this is a case where this concept of new service is not understood by me. The University Grant comes under 37 Education and I do not know why this special head evolved by the Government should be treated as a new service

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

at all. This is one of the matters in which I required clarification at the earliest stage and that clarification has not been made on behalf of Government so far. The more important point in connection with the University is this. The University Grants Commission had always been prepared to sanction additional expenditure in respect of upgrading scales of salaries of the members of the tutorial staff of the University and all over India a particular scale has been sanctioned in various Universities but somehow or other our Government and our University have been persuaded to accept a lower scale of salary for our officers. I do not know why this discrimination should have been made. I have always held the view that if one considers that academic standards of high order should be obtained, one must keep teachers of whatever grade—they may be primary school teachers or they may be teachers in the University—you must keep them contented and they must have a reasonable standard of comfort which enables them to give of their best to the institution with which they are associated. This sum of Rs. 16 lakhs they have asked for the University is to satisfy the requirement of upgrading the scales of salary of the members of the University staff, and why that additional grant should have been reduced is more than I can understand. If only the Government would place the supplementary Demand before the Legislature I am sure that the Legislature would not hesitate to sanction it at least from the point of view of securing contentment and satisfaction of a particular section of the members of University staff.

Then coming to Demand No. 24, here is a case in which the demand of Rs. 12 lakhs is asked for on the ground that it is a case in which the Government of India is sanctioning Rs. 6 lakhs under social welfare scheme for Scheduled castes and tribes. One particular observation which I wish to make in respect of this is, this is a centrally sponsored scheme; I would very much like the Government of Mysore to take up this question with the Centre as a policy matter. Instead of giving a matching grant, in all these cases it should be treated as a block grant. This kind of matching grant that the Government of India is giving is complicating the issue in many States. In one case it is a question of prestige for a particular State Government to say that when they are prepared to give Rs. 10 lakhs, they cannot find a matching grant. It becomes ipmossible for State Government and particularly I am speaking of Mysore, it becomes very difficult, not that I am against spending more money for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and Tribes, but if this principle is accepted and if you go on making provision wherever a matching grant is sanctioned by the Government of India, because of a centrally sponsored scheme, it becomes impossible on grounds of economy to find money. Government should consider the advisability readily seeing that such grants are treated as block grants instead of matching grants.

After these grants are received by the Government of Mysore, I think the manner and method of distribution of such grant have assumed the proportion of scandal in the villages. If one goes to villages and sees the basis of such allotment, how the building materials are distributed, one will be surprised. If there are villages, each comprising of 30-40 families of Adikarnatakas or Adi Dravidas, one will see that two families alone, at the most three families will get a few tens of bamboos and a few hundreds of tiles, which makes it impossible for that man to make use of them even for the bath room or the cattle shed. I think a complete reorientation of the method of distribution of the building materials is called for. I knew of the existence of a certain advisory body in each district there was a committee and I do not know what these committees are doing, what these bodies are doing. There is a feeling gaining ground in villages that even in respect of such schedule caste families, members belonging to particular political affiliations only are getting

these materials. That may be true or may not be true, but there is room for suspicion. I know that the declared policy of the Government is not encourage to distribution of building materials, being influenced by political considerations. But the fact remains that there is a feeling and that there is sufficient ground for justification of the feeling. I very much like the Minister in charge to see that a particular plan is drawn up. The Government must draw up a regular plan for distribution, select the villages. Let the whole village be satisfied. Instead of going round and distributing a few bamboos and tiles in one village and spreading it throughout the State, it is much better that they do concentrated work so that a few people may be satisfied. They should draw up a programme in consultation with the particular bodies at the district level or taluk level. Otherwise, this irrational distribution of building materials will continue We are coming to the end of the official year. Will this grant which has been received by the Government lapse or will it be funded? What is the use asking for a supplementary grant? Have you any reasonable prospect of spending it or is action taken already to spend this amount or are they asking for supplementary grant after incurring the expenditure—that has not been made clear in the note furnished under the Demand.

Coming to Demand No. 25, relating to Bangalore milk supply scheme, appropriately this Government should have worked the scheme through a co-operative union or a milk supply union. I do not know what the details of the scheme are. I was not here. The other day the Speaker was pleased to observe that the details of the scheme had been published in the gazette and in papers. I am sorry I am a new entrant to this Assembly, but the whole idea of sponsoring the scheme for dairy development which is a centrally sponsored scheme is that it should be worked through a co-operative union instead of any particular local body taking it up. I seek one clarification on the point whether the distribution of milk which is made under the auspices of the Corporation is through the co-operative societies. Unless they press into service the co-operative movement for working the scheme, I am afraid they are not going in the right way. This may be a case of too many irons in the fire. So for as the Corporation is Concerned, I do not think this is a correct stand to be taken up particularly in a city like Bangalore, We are very anxious that this scheme should be fully implemented and that it should be an unqualified success. Government will see that the principles of co-operation are applied in order that the scheme may succeed. It is not clear whether the amount is to be paid to the Corporation or the several Unions. The Explanatory Note furnished gives no idea of these details.

Coming to Demand No. 29, here is another case where as much as Rs. 24 lakhs are asked to be sanctioned by the Legislature by way of a supplementary grant. The Note says that "as this is the working season, and as the works in progress in Cauvery, Mysore, Bangalore and Shimoga Circles have to be completed, the additional grant as above is necessary." For more than six months in the year they have not spent even Rs. 8 lakhs. Rs. 7·25 is the amount which is booked as expenditure. I think it is too much to expect the department to spend this additional grant they have asked for during the remaining months of the year. But even so under item No. 2 they are asking for 50 per cent of the original grant which was provided in the budget. That shows a very defective budgeting and no knowledge of the amount to be fixed at the time of framing the budget. I think they did not even foresee the expenditure. They are asking for Rs. 5,61,000; they are asking for as much as 50 per cent of the grant. Here is a case where there is a notable departure from the usual practice of asking for supplementary grant. After all, why did they not foresee in excess expenditure this particular instance?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Rain havoc.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Under item No. 3, they have noted that "the provision could be met by reappropriation of sanctioned grants." What is meant by that? They have also noted "construction of bridges across (1) Uppanda river (2) Kalyanapur river and (3) Mabukkal river. ಮೂರನೆಯ ಐಟಂನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—We are getting moneys for this purpose from the Government of India which is going into the consolidated fund. This has to be brought to the notice of the Legislature and get their approval for this work.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even in regard to the grant of ten lakhs asked for communication—special repairs to roads, the category of roads in respect of which this amount is to be spent is not mentioned, whether they are for trunk roads, or district roads or other roads. An explanatory note is necessary for the legislature to understand. I would very much request the Treasury Benches to see that these explanatory notes are really explanatory, instead of creating more difficulties and more doubts.

Then, Sir, there was a wholesome practice in the previous years, I do not know whether it is true and I am open to correction, as a rule we used to see that receipts from motor vehicles tax were earmarked for repairs and in no year should the expenditure on roads exceed the amount of vehicle tax received in that year. If the expenditure under repairs of roads exceeds the amounts received by way of vehicle taxes, it is very difficult for Government to provide funds. There is a tendency lately in the Public Works Department, because grants are readily made available. They continue to ask for more grants even without a prospect of spending it in time. In many cases it has happened. They are never starved of funds. They seem to suffer under the luxury of grants. In some cases, even when a supplementary grant was asked for, they have not been able to spend the original grant. Here is one instance where the amount of money spent on repairs is in excess of the tax recovered under motor vehicles. I only mention this for the Hon'ble Minister to see whether the expenditure cannot be regulated.

Under Demand No. 32, there is a mention made that in the Gulbarga Division, some money has been spent for maintaining four approach roads. I am asking whether it is legitimate to spend moneys from the State Revenues for the maintenance of approach roads. It is difficult to say so with reference to the explanatory note. The explanatory note for a supplementary Demand is blissfully evasive on the point. In fact it is totally silent. Can approach roads be taken at all for being repaired out of State Fundss? Is it an approach road from where and where to?

Under Demand No. 38, Sir, there is a question of principle involved. In the early days of the session, I have raised an issue on the floor of this House whether on principle a fresh item of expenditure can be taken without an accepted policy. Improvement of gomal lands and the question of spending money out of State revenue is a question of policy. This House has not given its consent either in principle or in theory. Here is a supplementary grant asked for a new item of expenditure. They do not even call it a new service. I am not one of those against improvement of gomal lands. I have felt that as much attention to grazing lands should be given as we are devoting for lands on which food crops are grown. It is only the principle of spending money that I am concerned with. I would like this matter to be kept by so that if the issue is decided it may be taken up.

Under item No. 42—I have got to say something about every one of these items—they say that so far as maintenance and repairs are concerned "Item No. 1: No provision was made in the Budget for 1957-58 under this head. Now the provision is found necessary for maintenance of Gokak Canal in Ghataprabha Left Bank Canal Division No. 1." I cannot understand

why it was left out in the original Budget.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—It is oversight on the part of the local officers.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then under Item No. 3 "the additional grant is required in connection with the construction of a branch canal at Chainage 3506 of South Canal of Dambal Tank, Petha Mundargi, Gadag Taluk, to increase food production." Here is a case of an expansion of an existing Irrigation Project. Coming in for supplementary grants. I do not know why the Public Works Department did not include this provision in their estimate. It is not as if a channel to a Tank is an unforeseen item of expenditure. All this gets so unrealistic and even to criticise it one gets fed up with the kind of negligence, carelessness and absolute callousness with which these estimates are brought under Demands and passed on explanatory notes for the information of this House. I should like to know if there is no programme even now drawn up for expanding the system of canals. It is much better that the Minister for Public Works formulates a Demand having in view all the expenditure required.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—In connection with item No. 3, this is a recently sanctioned one. Formerly there was that canal, and later on account of the need for increasing food production, this scheme was thought of and on investigation it was found feasible. Therefore it was recently started. It was not thought of beforehand.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then under item No. 5, it is stated that "the additional grant is in respect of frequency Conversion Scheme and that expenditure booked to the end of October 1957 is Rs. 2,36,374 according to Departmental figures against a provision of Rs. 3,75,000." I really cannot understand what exactly this is. Item No. 5 is Vani Vilas Water Works. What has that to do with the Frequency Conversion? There is a mistake or I am making a mistake. Item No. 5 relates to Vani Vials Water Works for an estimated further expenditure of Rs. 1,25,000. Here it says that the additional grant is in respect of Frequency Conversion Scheme......

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—From 25 cycle to 50 cycle......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That I know, Sir. But what is the appropriateness of the explanatory note under the Demand......

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—For the motor being rewinded......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am grateful to my friend Sri Puttaswamy. But I have got something to say if it is accepted.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—This comes under water supply to Mysore City.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I request the Hon'ble Minister to read the note under item No. 5 and give me a clarification. Is that a correct explanatory note under item No. 5? To mention that the grant is in respect of frequency conversion scheme under maintenance and repairs looks so ridiculous. I do not know how to reconcile the explanatory note when the supplementary demand asked for is for maintenance and repairs. Is that a correct explanatory note?

(*Interruption*).

I want to make matters clear and I cannot understand things unless they are appropriately explained. Till such time as the Hon'ble Minister gets the explanation, I will go on to item No. 6. Here Government is asking a grant for meeting arrears of power charges. To what period do these arrears relate? It would have been much better if the period had been mentioned in the explanatory note.

Going back to item No. 4,—about which I missed making an important observation—it has been stated that "this additional grant is needed to meet the cost of rain damage works under Visveswaraya Canal and its distributaries (against a total grant of Rs. 9,41,000 for "1. K.R.S." an outlay of Rs. 6,07,728 according to Departmental figures has already been booked in the first six months of 1957-58".

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Here is a case, in which it seems to be a hardy annual. I do not know why lakhs of rupees are being allotted every year for repairs of this kind on account of rain damage. What concrete steps have Government in the appropriate department taken for preventing this kind of damage year after year? If continuously we are going to provide 6 to 8 lakhs for repairs, I am afraid, we will have to take serious notice of it. I want to know, if this is a recurring Demand, what is the nature of the damage? Are estimates prepared? Is this demand in respect of regular estimates prepared?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಬಹಳ heavy rains ಬಂತಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಅದು ನನಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

If that is so easily explained, it is well and good. Everybody knows, there were heavy rains, but year after year if this item is going to be capitalised to the extent of 6 to 8 lakhs, what would be the fate? A fundamental problem is involved here, not that I am bothered about 8 lakhs that is being asked here. How is the Government going to prevent this kind of repetition? It is not as if they can prevent the rains from coming. What is it that they are going to do to see that this recurring expenditure is avoided?

Under item No. 8, 'Other Works', it has been stated that the additional grant is necessary for the maintenance of tanks recently constructed. Merely because the item runs to four digit figures, the Department or the officers who prepared the Demand, might have thought that it would be accepted. Why are there any repairs to tanks recently constructed? Is this necessary for major tanks? Is it the responsibility of the ryots to meet the expenditure?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಕೆರೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು maintain ಮಾಡಬೇಡವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಪಾಠ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

My fundamental objection is that the explanatory notes are confusing. I wish they were not there at all. If they were to be there, I wish they were a little explanatory. The Government want some money for some purpose. Why don't they tell us all about it? What prevented them from making the explanatory notes a little less confusing? Even in respect of a small or a big item, the explanatory notes are the same.

Under item No. 11, 5 lakhs are being asked for "meeting the cost of purchase of pipes specially got for execution of deposit works. Expenditure booked to the end of October 1957 is reported to be Rs. 7,73,953 against Rs. 5 lakhs provided". My objection is this: It is not as if the cost of pipes was not known in time. Did the Government not call for tenders for competitive quotations? Did they not know the number of pipes required and at what cost? Why should there be any increase? Is it that they have expanded the lines?

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—They are deposit works. During the current year, there may have been deposits and fresh works might have been undertaken.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am not prepared to accept any such hypothetical statement. I want to know the whole truth from the Government. What is it that made them not anticipate the Demand?

Under Demand No. 57,—I do not know if I am making a mistake—the contingency fund was only of the order of 1 crore rupees. Here is a statement in respect of item No. 1 for the advance of 1 crore 18 lakhs on two different accounts, one of 25 lakhs and another of 93 lakhs. Is it as a result of the ordinance that you were able to spend this full amount of 118 lakhs and if so what is the date on which this expenditure was incurred? Is it prior to the issue of the ordinance or subsequently? That is the material point I would like to know.

(Sri K. Puttaswamy rose to interrupt)

I think my friend Sri Puttaswamy is aiming to get himself transferred to the other bench.

(Interruptions)

I am referring to a particular seat, not to the whole bench. I would certainly take an answer from him if he had occupied another seat. I really wish that a man like him occupies the seat. I would congratulate him then. (*Laughter*).

I wanted to know in respect of this item whether the amount was spent and the expenditure incurred in excess of the Contingency Fund. The explanatory note does not say anything about the time or the occasion on which this amount was spent. What was the quantum of the Contingency Fund at the beginning of the year and what was it at the time the expenditure was incurred ?

I do not wish to take any more time of the House and I shall be grateful if the points raised by me are clarified.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—As many as 29 Demands have been placed before the House and I could say that nearly 15 items do not deserve to get our approval because of the fact that some of these Demands should have been foreseen earlier and could have been provided in the regular estimates for 1957-58 or some of them might have been shifted for the budget estimates of 1958-59. There is some ulterior motive in having these Demands placed before this House by way of supplementary estimates. Looking at these Demands, I should say that there is lack of diligence or vigilance on the part of the Government. As my friend Sri Mallaradhya pointed out, there is no definition for the word "New Services". Of course Article 205 of the Constitution of India makes a provision for this term 'new services'. But anything and everything cannot be classified under this definition. What are the things that the Government have chosen to claim as 'New Services'? Reorganisation of the Departments, taxes on vehicles and the payment of an additional sum of money to the University, reorganisation of the Department of *Mysore Gazetteer*. Even while presenting the budget last year, the Finance Minister said that the Government contemplated bringing uniform taxation laws in all the areas. The Government knew perfectly well that new Acts would come up. Such being the case, why did the Government not provide in the budget estimates of 1957-58 for the expenditure to be incurred in respect of the reorganisation of taxation department ? That shows that they have been negligent in making suitable or adequate provision for the expenditure that is likely to be spent in respect of these items.

The Government was well aware even in January and February 1957 that the Mysore University is to do several things and that it has increased the scales of pay in respect of employees of the University and that the Government would have to take its share.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ. ಈಗ ವೇಳಾಪಟ್ಟಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 20ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. 21ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಹಬ್ಬ. 20ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಊರು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ 12 ಗಂಟೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಟ್ರೈನು ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಊರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಇದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹಬ್ಬ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ 18ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. 18ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಗಿಸದೆ ಹೋದರೆ 19ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಸಭೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನದೊಳಗೆ ಮುಗಿಸಬಹುದು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes, we will have the session on 19th morning.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—20ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ರಜವೋ ?

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೌದು.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was just submitting that adequate provision was not made by the Government in the Budget Estimates of 1957-58 towards the grant that has to be paid to the University. I do not understand

(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

when they have provided Rs. 10 lakhs in view of the fact that several commitments were made by the University, they could also have paid another Rs. 10 lakhs in the Budget Estimates of 1957-58. But that has not been done.

With respect to the other new Service that is referred to in Demand No. 29 regarding construction of three bridges across rivers, it has been stated that the works have since been sanctioned. Though the Minister for Public Works was pleased to say that the Central Government would give assistance and that the amount is spent out of that, still Sir, I maintain that the estimated costs of these works had not been given and since it has been treated as a new service, there is a mandatory provision under article 205 which states that the Governor shall cause to be laid before the House or the Houses of the Legislature of the State another statement showing the estimated amount of the expenditure. I maintain, Sir, that since the estimated costs of these works have not been mentioned, it is a violation of the mandatory provision of the Constitution and also it is a violation of Rule 129 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House because a token grant is asked for when no estimated cost is given. The works have been sanctioned. How much amount has been spent so far and how much they hope to spend at the end of the year, they are not able to say. I do not understand how this should be treated as 'New Service'.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Sir, regarding item No. 3 last year and current year a crore of rupees was provided for. It lapsed because Government of India did not give that money. This year also a token amount is provided and it depends upon how much they give. It is only to bring to the notice of this house that such and such a work is going to be taken up that this is brought here.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—My submission is, if it is not in conformity with the Constitution, how can this House approve? I am only speaking on principle. Sir, several works have been sanctioned under new schemes of Second Five-Year Plan for 1957-58 to the tune of 28 crores. It is said in the Governor's Address that only about 20 or 21 crores is expected to be spent. When 6 or 7 crores remain unspent out of the amount already allotted, how could these works be undertaken when works already sanctioned are unfulfilled? How could it be treated as 'New Service', much less without giving any estimate?

Sir, for another item under Demand No. 47, *i.e.*, item No. 2 a token grant of 100 rupees is asked. This is for the work relating to the construction of a salt water exclusion dam across the Arur River in Arur Village in South Kanara district. This is also treated as a New Work. Here also the estimated cost of the work is not known. Moreover, we do not know how much money has already been spent and how much is going to be spent before the completion of the work. By getting approval for these token grants, Government will get unfettered power to spend as much as they like. It is for the House to consider whether these deserve the approval of the House.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Sir, with your permission I shall explain now itself so that I may save some time when I reply. This was sanctioned for 1,20,000 last month, *i.e.*, 22nd January 1958. As could be seen, this was sanctioned after the Budget was passed. It has been found that some money could be found for this by re-appropriation. Therefore, this grant is asked for here. Regarding the other objection by my friend Sri Venkatai Gowda about the three bridges and the estimates therefor, the figures are like this. For the construction of bridge across Uppanda it is 8.5 lakhs; for the bridge across Kalyanapur River it is 13.38 lakhs and for the bridge across Mabukkal River it is 21.52 lakhs.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—My submission is, why should this be taken in the middle of the year when there are several works which are sanctioned and not undertaken and money

surrendered to Government? When these works are not fulfilled, what was the necessity for these works? It is not at all my contention that these works should not be undertaken. My only objection is that when works sanctioned in 1957-58 were not taken up at all, there was no necessity to take up these works. Government could have foreseen all this and could have provided for in the Budget. That they have not done. I must say that they have not done this with a view to show a lesser deficit in the Budget. If all these had been included in the Budget, the deficit would have been more by 7 to 8 crores than what it actually was for 1957-58.

Coming to Demand No 8, I submit that Government knew that they were going to reorganise the Department of Commercial Taxes. They ought to have made provision for the extra expenditure even in the Budget for 1957-58. What is the justification in asking us now to vote for this expenditure?

In respect of Interest on Permanent Loan, Loans transferred from the Bombay State under the State Reorganisation Act, it is said, Sir, that the amount is to meet the interest charges of the loans transferred from Bombay for the last five months of 1956-57 expected to be adjusted during that year, but actually passed on for adjustment during the current year. Why was it not adjusted? When the loans from Madras Karnatak and Hyderabad Karnatak were adjusted in 57-58, why was this not adjusted last year? They have already asked for 7 lakhs and odd 4 lakhs and odd for 4½ per cent Development Loan 1969 and discount on Loans - 4½ per cent Development Loans, 1969. We do not know from what month we are asked to pay that interest. This could have been included in the Budget for 1958-59. What was the necessity for asking now?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, the 1969 Loan was issued in September 1957 and interest has to be distributed before 31st March 1958.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It was floated in September 1957 and the interest could have been met possibly in 58-59 *i.e.*, in the coming Budget.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—We would be defaulters if we did not pay it by 31st March 1958.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Would it not have been possible to make a provision in the Budget for 1958-59? When Government contemplated to float this loan, they could have anticipated the interest and could have made a provision in the 57-58 Budget.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—It is a basic error to anticipate and provide in the Budget. Criticisms are levelled against Government that they have included and provided for unprecised things.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Regarding Demand No. 19, in the Explanatory Note it is said :—

> "The schemes of the Reorganisation of the Department of Mines and Geology was sanctioned November 1957 and an average extra cost of Rs. 2,14,618 (recurring) and Rs. 90,000 (non-recurring). Though the scheme is not likely to be implemented during the current year, a token grant is proposed to cover any minor expenditure that may be incurred......"

Sir, it is not definitely known whether any expenditure is incurred by this time and how much is likely to be incurred at the end of the financial year. I do not know why this token grant is being asked when they themselves do not know definitely as to how much money they are going to spend.

So far as Demand No. 27 is concerned it is said that Khadi Centres run by Government have been transferred to the control of the Khadi and Village Industries Board and that to meet the establishment charges, a grant of Rs. 35,000 has been advanced from the Contingency Fund, and as that can be met by reappropriation, a token grant is necessary. I want to know whether the Government had not these things in view at the time of presenting the budget estimates for 1957-58 and if they had these things in view why they did not make suitable provision for these, specially items 5 and 6.

(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

Coming to Demand No. 28 regarding Labour Courts, the Hon'ble Minister for Labour had given an assurance even during the Budget discussion that Labour Courts would be constituted and so Government had known that they would have to incur expenditure on these items. That being the case, they should have made provision for them even in the budget estimates for 1957-58 which they have failed to do and now we cannot reconcile to their demand for those things by way of supplementary estimates.

Under Demand No. 38, in the Explanatory Note it is said that a scheme for encouraging the growing of grass in village grazing lands is being implemented immediately. I do not know when the scheme was started, whether any money was sanctioned for in the budget for 1957-58. Even if provision had not been made for it in the budget for 1957-58, I do not know what was the hurry for taking it up during the year asking for a supplementary Demand for it. I am opposed to this method of asking for grants by way of supplementary Demands when things could have been foreseen. My friend Sri Mallaradhya has already dealt with Demand No. 42 at some length and so I will not take the time of the House by referring to it again.

Coming to Demand No. 58, for item No. 2 a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs has been spent and a token grant of Rs. 100 has been asked for. My submission is that in respect of these demands Government could have foreseen them even at the time of the presentation of the budget for 1957-58. Or they could have deferred some of these items to be included in the budget for 1958-59. It seems to me that only some of the Demands made are genuine and *bona fide*. For instance, they have transferred Rs. 50 lakhs to the Electricity Board. This could not have been anticipated. Then about Rs. 1 lakh was spent for purchase of foodgrains. That also was necessary. Then breaches to some of the tanks had to be repaired and the expenditure for that also was necessary. The Demands in respect of these items of expenditure are Demands which deserve to be approved of by this House and not the other Demands which the Government could have foreseen and included in the Budget for 1957-58 itself. If some of these supplementary Demands had been included in the budget for 1957–58, then there would have been more deficit which the Government wanted to avoid. Or if some of these Demands had been included in the budget for 1958-59, then instead of presenting a surplus budget, our Finance Minister would have had to present a deficit budget. Some of these items of expenditure could have been shifted to the budget for 1957-58 or postponed to the budget for 1958-59. My submission is that the Government did not want to disclose the deficit nature of the budget and that is why these amounts are asked for as supplementary Demands.

As regards the reorganisation of the department of Commerical Taxes, I must say that the working of this Department is not satisfactory. The assessing authority has now been given wider jurisdiction. To quote an instance, formerly in Kollegal there was only one assessing authority having jurisdiction over that area only. But the jurisdiction has been widened by the inclusion of two more Taluks. The number of assessees coming under his jurisdiction has been increased and so he cannot now discharge his functions satisfactorily. I find that huge amounts remain uncollected as taxes. This is a thing which cannot be reconciled. If only our Government studies the procedure adopted for collection of taxes in the neighbouring State of Madras, it will find that there not a single pie remains as arrears of tax to be collected. If Madras can collect the taxes without allowing them to fall into arrears, I do not understand why we also cannot do so and why huge sums should remain as arrears of taxes here. We have been told on the floor of the House during question time that some of arrears of taxes are outstanding since 1950. The steps that the Government are taking for their recovery are very inadequate and

more vigorous steps should have been taken. I am told that when cases go to the appellate authorities, the Government are in the habit of issuing a stay order in respect of the arrears. I do not understand why Government should grant such stay orders. If Government feel that the assessments are not correct and have to be revised, Government should ask the assessee to deposit sufficient security to meet the assessment and then the case may be decided by the appellate authority. In Madras such stay orders are not issued by the Government. There if an assessee appeals against the assessment, he has got first to deposit sufficient security and then only his appeal will be heard. It may be argued that the High Court also grants stays. My submission is that we have got to represent to the High Court against that. We have got to impress upon the High Court the necessity for asking the assessee to deposit sufficient security. Suppose the assessee becomes insolvent before the case is finally decided. Then the Government would lose the whole amount. That is the reason why the assessee should be asked to deposit sufficient security before and appeal against the original assessment is entertained.

I understand that the Commercial Tax Department is short of sufficient trained personnel and that occasionally they draw personnel from the Revenue Department. My submission is that such staff would be raw hands not experienced in this work. The proper thing for the Commercial Tax Department to do is to recruit their own officers and train them and they should see that the taxes are collected in time.

Having made these observations, I submit that some of these Demands do not deserve to be approved of by this House.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are asked to vote for the supplementary estimates in respect of 56 Demands. As mentioned in the Introductory Memorandum, supplementary Demands can be presented to the House on two grounds, namely (1) when the original provision is found to be insufficient for expenditure and (2) when the expenditure is on a 'new service.' Looking closely to the various supplementary Demands, one thing is very clear and that is that very few of the supplementary Demands claimed fall under either of these two categories. Most of them are a sort of omissions or lapses on the part of the Government. For almost all the Demands the explanation given is that no provision was made in the budget. So they are omissions and Government have failed to provide for those items in the budget. Some of those items are of a routine character which could have been easily foreseen by the various Departments, but they failed to include them in the budget and now we are asked to vote for the failure of this Government. That has been our lot in this House.

The explanatory notes are far from satisfactory. The notes are very meagre and insufficient and they lack the necessary details. They do not give us a clear picture of the items of expenditure. From these notes we do not know why we should vote for these Demands. I will take them up one by one.

Coming to Demand No. 2, even though I come from Belgaum, I do not know what is meant by Kanungo Establishment. It is not our term.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—It is your term.

4 P.M.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Will the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue be pleased to explain what is meant by 'Kanungo establishment'?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The history is this. 'Kanungo' is a pre-British word. It is a Persian word. It means inspector. The Hon'ble Member knows that in the Bombay State, Circle Inspectors and others are appointed to inspect. That establishment is called 'Kanungo' establishment. In record it is called 'Kanungo' establishment.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This is the first time that I am hearing this word, Sir. This term is not in vogue in our area.

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

Sir, it is said here that even the pay of the establishment could not be foreseen in order to make provision in the budget. This expenditure could have been easily foreseen. It was a routine expenditure; and it is simply an omission—an unpardonable omission, I may say. Such omissions do not give any credit to this Government. I am afraid many such omissions. I have been receiving complaints from my constituency and from my district that several Government employees have not received their salaries—particularly the temporary whose term is extended from time to time. Several of them have not received their salaries for months together. They have sent in number of applications, but they are not getting their salaries. I know several such cases. So, I say, such omissions are unpardonable.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—May I know which Government servant has not received his pay ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—At this moment, I do not remember all the names. I will submit a list of temporary people. Positively, there are some in the Health Department.

Then I come to Demand No. 5. Item 2 of the explanatory note says that this additional grant is necessary in respect of sandal wood supplied to the factory. This is rather extra-ordinary, because this is a factory running for the last several years. It is not a new factory. This item could have easily been foreseen.

In respect of Demand No. 8 it is stated :

> "The additional expenditure is on account of the Reorganisation of the Department of Commercial Taxes . . . . "

I take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the Government and of the House that this reorganisation has brought great inconvenience to the people at Belgaum and Marathi areas. With the advent of reorganisation, almost all the persons appointed are Kannada-speaking. Most of them do not know Marathi. Belgaum is predominantly a Marathi town, it is a predominantly Marathi area. I may say here that 98 per cent of the merchants of Belgaum keep their accounts in Marathi; and these officers as a matter of fact should know Marathi. Merchants are therefore finding great difficulty with officers not knowing Marathi. There is another fact. That the forms necessary in respect of sales-tax are not supplied. They do not properly supply the forms and they supply when they supply forms printed in English or Kannada. Marathi forms are not available. The Commissioner of Sales Tax had been to Belgaum and I brought this fact to his notice and requested that Marathi forms might be supplied to merchants. Still, they have not been supplied. So, the merchants are finding it difficult to fill the forms. They have got to spend at least Re. 1 for translators. The Reorganisation is thus causing great inconvenience to my people, Sir.

Demand No. 10: This amount of Rs. 20 lakhs has been spent on extensive repair works. We are not supplied with the list of such works. What these works are, we do not know. Why should not the Hon'ble Minister supply that list? Why should there be a Demand for such a huge amount ? My request is that Government should supply a detailed list of these works.

Demand No. 14 : This is for a sum of Rs. 1,32,600 and it is stated that it is required to be spent on account of the increased number of sitting in the year. We should think of this. They should ponder over this. Who is responsible for this additional expenditure ? I regret to say, Sir, that we are sitting in this House with a sort of guilty conscience, because we are doing comparatively very little business. Please excuse me, Sir, if I indulge in comparisons. I must be excused if I state here that during the last session of the Bombay Assembly, during a period of 40 days, they passed 32 Bills, while we here sitting from June onwards, to October end I doubt whether we have finished hardly a dozen legislative measures.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I wonder why my Hon'ble friend is making such comparisons. Comparisons are odious. It is better such comparisons are not drawn. There may be something to be said against Bombay.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—My intention is to point out facts. The Treasury Benches are responsible for the increased number of sittings. All the legislations and motions are postponed from day to day because there is no unanimity in the Congress Party. I do not understand why the State should pay for the dissentions in the Congress Party.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—My friend is saying something which is not at all correct.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Ranibennur).—The disunity in the party will not at all come in the way of the proceedings of this House.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am stating the experience of the last session. Experience is on my side. I think we should be more serious in this respect. We should transact more business and if the Government is unable to cope up with the work, I think they should quit and make room for better men.

Coming to Demand No. 20, I wish to bring one point to the notice of the Government as well as to the Hon'ble Members of this House. I have been receiving complaints from various educational institutions in my district that they have not been receiving grants. As this Demand refers to education, I take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the Government this fact.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, so far as this Demand is concerned, the issue is specific. It is in respect of the University. I would like to know whether it is in order for him to raise a general point about the non-receipt of grants by various educational institutes.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As this Demand pertains to University education, I wish to bring to the notice of this House as well as to the Government the grievance of my constituency in this behalf. For example, I may quote the example of the Rani Parvathi Devi College at Belgaum. It has not recceived various grants to the tune of Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 40,000. The college authorities have sent telegrams and reminders to the Government in the Education Department, but uptil now they have not been able to get those various grants. Now, the year is coming to a close and perhaps I am afraid their grants may lapse. My request to Government is that this should not happen.

As regards Demand No. 25, this item could have been easily foreseen because reference was made to this scheme in the last year's budget speech by the Hon'ble the Finance Minister. So, I see no reason why provision was not made in the budget. It was quite known that the Government was going to launch that scheme and so it was essential that provision should have been made for that scheme in the budget.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—Was it not postponed?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I do not think so. As far as I remember, a reference was made to this scheme by the Hon'ble Finance Minister. So, this cannot be a post-budget scheme.

Turning to Demand No. 27, item No. 6, a sum of Rs. 53,900 was paid as grant-in-aid to the Janata Sikshana Samithi, Dharwar. We do not know for what purpose this grant was given. How are we to know that this is a 'new service'? Perhaps it might be favouritism. One thing I would like to bring to the notice of this House is that there is a feeling in my district that Dharwar District is getting all the benefits of this administration while Belgaum District is being neglected.

In respect of Demand No. 29, item 1, it is stated in the explanatory note that 'as this is the working season, and as the works in progress in Cauvery, Mysore, Bangalore and Shimoga Circles have to be completed, the additional grant as above is necessary.' In this connection, I may bring to the notice of this House that there is a strong

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

feeling in the integrated areast hat the newly integrated areas are being neglected while all attention is concentrated on the erstwhile Mysore Area. Such feelings and fears should be removed from the minds of the people.

As regards Item No. 4, the reason given is to carry on repair works of the damages due to heavy rains and floods in the several circles. They have not given us details. I do not understand why the Government has not supplied details in this behalf. Before asking us to vote, the Government should supply a list of all these repair works.

Coming to Demand No. 42, Item No. 1, I should say that it is also a grave omission. I think the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works may explain that it was due to oversight that provision was not made for the maintenance of the Gokak Canal. It is not a new project. It is 40 years or more old. I do not understand why there should be such an omission.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I said that I was asking for explanation.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Thank you, Sir.

In regard to Item No. 11, it is stated in the explanatory note that the 'expenditure booked to the end of October 1957 is reported to be Rs. 7,73,953 against Rs. 5,00,000 provided.' So, over and above the budget provision of Rs. 5,00,000, expenditure has been booked to the extent of Rs. 2 lakhs and more. I do not understand why this amount was not foreseen.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Sir, may I explain the position? We wanted pipes for these water works and at one time we thought the cost of iron pipes would be all right. Steel pipes could not be obtained within the country and so they had to be imported from foreign countries. On account of foreign exchange difficulties we thought we might only make use of cast iron pipes. In the meanwhile, the Bhadravati Iron and Steel works came forward to supply cast iron and steel pipes. They expedited the matter and supplied them. So, when the bill came, that had to be paid. That is why this extra expenditure of Rs. 2 lakhs has been incurred.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Thank you.

As for Demand No. 47, Item No. 1, some technical terms are used. We do not know their meanings. We have not been given an idea as to which reservoir it is. It is stated 'for laying a 24″ C.I. main from C and M Reservoir to Low Level Reservoir for increasing the carrying capacity of 27″ gravity line ......'. Where are these low level reservoir and high ground reservoir?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—All over the City of Bangalore and the Cantonment Area.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It should have been mentioned; it is not mentioned here; whether it is Bangalore or Bellary or Ghataprabha or any other place we do not know.

Then I come to Demand No. 57 and 57 A. Government, I think, has started very late the scheme in the matter of procuring paddy. Government has not been of help to the cultivators, because while fixing the paddy rates, Government have fixed the same very low. The southern zone was formed. That came as a calamity to the cultivators, because the paddy from Belgaum District used to be exported to Bombay State. As soon as the zonal system was imposed, all these exports were stopped and naturally the price of paddy went down. When the rate was Rs. 30 it came down immediately to Rs. 22 to 23. So the cultivators had to suffer on account of the zonal system. The zonal system has not been of use to the State. So the Government should press on the Central Government to smash the zonal system. I think the Government is of the same opinion because I remember that our Hon'ble Revenue Minister expressed that the zonal system was not of any use to this State.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I have not said so. I have not said that the southern zone is of no use. I have said that according to the expectation, the rice

is not moving from Andhra to Mysore; I have not said that I am against the zonal system.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—As far as I remember from what appeared in the press, it is my impression.........

Sri M. P. PATIL.—So, does the Hon'ble Member want paddy to go to Bombay at the cost of Mysore?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—About the rate that is fixed......

Sri M. P. PATIL.—On the point of rate also, Government has not fixed any rate. Government is purchasing at market rate.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—At least the rate for voluntary purchase ought to be fixed at Rs. 13-00 per Bengal maund. But the Government is purchasing at the rate of Rs. 10-12-0.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—That is the market rate.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I do not think that is the market rate. I think the Government is taking undue advantage of the plight of the cultivators. The rate ought to be Rs. 13 per Bengal maund. That would be Rs. 23-8-0 per bag of paddy; that was the reasonable rate.

Then about Demand No. 28. These are all Labour Courts. At the same time expenditure was contemplated at the time of the budget. The Industrial Disputes Act came into force since March 1957 long before the budget was passed. So this expenditure was contemplated and should have been included in the last budget. It was easy to contemplate and include it in the last budget.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಜಿ. ಖೋತ್ (ಸಾದಲ್ಗ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 1957-58ನೆಯ ವರ್ಷದ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ತರಹಗಳಿವೆ. ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಸ್ಕೀಂ, ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಎಂದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಹೆಸರು ಇದ್ದರೂ ಒಂದು ಒರಿಜನಲ್ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ.

ಈಗ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ (1) ರಲ್ಲಿ "Collection of Taxes on Agricultural Income" ಬಾಬಿಗೆ 17,300 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್‌ಚರಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಯಿತು ಆದರೆ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಭಾಗ ಹೊಗೇಸೊಪ್ಪು, ವರ್ಜೀನಿಯಾ ಹೊಗೇಸೊಪ್ಪು ಮತ್ತು ಆರ್ಡಿನರಿ ಹೊಗೇಸೊಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಮೂರು ಭಾಗಗಳಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಎಕರೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹತ್ತು ಎಕರೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಒಂದು ದೀರ್ಘ ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಗೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕಂಡಾಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿಯ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ವರಮಾನದ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಯೋಗ್ಯರೀತಿಯಿಂದ 10 ಎಕರೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು 20 ಎಕರೆ ಕಾಂಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ, ಅದೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಯೋಗ್ಯ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಗೊಳಪಡುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಏನೇ ಆಗಲಿ, 10 ಎಕರೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು 20 ಎಕರೆ ಕಾಂಪೊಸಿಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸೂಚನೆ.

4-30 P.M.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಎಂಟನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ 2 ಲಕ್ಷ 98 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಮರ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ವರ್ಗದ ಖರ್ಚು ವೆಚ್ಚಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ, ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್‌ಚರಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದೇನೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವಾಗ ಆಯಾ ಭಾಗದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿರಿಸಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಡಿಯ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಒಂದೇ ದರವನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಭಾಗದಕಡೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದಯ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಕಷ್ಟನಿಷ್ಠೂರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಜನರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಿವೇದನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇವಲ ಎರಡು ಫರ್ಲಾಂಗ್ ದೂರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂಬೈ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಹದ್ದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ತಯಾರಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಉಂಟಾಗಿ ಸಾವಿರ ಹಜಾರ್‌ಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಲುಕ್ಸಾನಾಗುವ ಸಂಭವವಿದೆ. ಆ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಏರಿಯಾಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಗ್ಜೆಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಬೌಂಡ್ರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾದಿದೆ. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಲ್ಲ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಎಗ್ಜೆಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹಾಗೆ ಎಗ್ಜೆಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಲುಕ್ಸಾನಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಭವವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಟೊಬ್ಯಾಕೋ ಕಡ್ಡಿ ಕಸಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಎರಡು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಜಿ. ಖೋತ್)

ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ. ಟೊಬ್ಯಾಕೋ ಕಡ್ಡಿ ಕಸ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಈ ರಾಮೆಟೇರಿಯಲ್ಸ್ ಅಂತ ಏನಿವೆ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಚಲೋ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಇವುಗಳಿಂದ ಔಷಧೋಪಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಮತ್ತೆ ನಶ್ಯ ಬಣ್ಣ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆನು. ಈ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾದ ಉದ್ಯಮ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆನು. ಇದೊಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ತರುವಂಥಾ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸಲಹೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ—ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಹರಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಿಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಲಾಭ ತರುವಂಥಾ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ ಇದು. ಆದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ಟಾರ್ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ಟಾರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I heard him saying that the Hon'ble the Minister for Industries stated that the Cement Industry was one which could be taken over by the private sector. Am I correct in my presumption ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಜಿ. ಖೋತ್.—ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಸುಣ್ಣದ ಹರಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರಿಂದ ಸಿಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು.........

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—Private Sector ಈ ಸಿಮೆಂಟ್ ತಯಾರಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಸಚಿವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ?

Sri B. G. KHOT.—Yes. It is so, Sir. ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ಟಾರಿನವರು ಕೈಗೆಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—How all these questions arise I do not know.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ ಜಿ. ಖೋತ್.—ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಟೊಬ್ಯಾಕೋ ರಾಮೆಟೀರಿಯಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಲೈಮ್ ಸ್ಟೋನು ಇವುಗಳ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಶಕ್ಯವಿದ್ದಷ್ಟು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 29ರಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ 56-57ನೆಯ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು 1958-59ನೆಯ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಚಿಕ್ಕೋಡಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಡೆಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ Finance Minister ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲವು ಬ್ರಿಡ್ಜ್‌ಗಳ ಅಗತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆಗ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವಾಸದಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ 24,33,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ worksನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳಾವುವೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಮಧ್ಯೇ Via Nipani Ichalakaranji ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ನದಿಗೆ ಬ್ರಿಡ್ಜ್ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಕಟ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೂದ್ ಗಂಗಾ ನದಿಗೆ ಬೇಡ್‌ಕೀಹಾಳ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಒಂದು ಬ್ರಿಡ್ಜ್ ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ, ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ನಣದಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಸಹ ಬಸ್ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮಳೆಗಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಹಳ್ಳಗಳನ್ನು ದಾಟಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಬಸ್ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು, ಗಳತಗಾಮ ಮದಾಪೂರ ನಡವೆ "ಪಾಂಡುರ ಹಳ್ಳಕ್ಕೆ", ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ನಣದಿ ಹಳ್ಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಎರಡು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಶಕ್ಯವಿದ್ದಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಆ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಚಿಕ್ಕನಾಯಕನ ಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ—ವರ್ಷದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇವರು ಈ ಮೊದಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಂಥಾ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಂಬಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೋ ಎನ್ನುತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕೋಟಿ 80 ಲಕ್ಷ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೇನೋ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅದನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳ ಏಳನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ "The State Port Officer has since intimated that the revised expenditure figure would be to the extent of Rs. 1,68,000 as per details given below" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಂದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಇವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಶಯ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ, ಆ ಯೋಜನೆ ಉಚಿತವೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ಮತ್ತು ವರ್ಷದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅಥವಾ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಮೊದಲು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೈಕೊಂಡು ಅನಂತರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ 68,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ

ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಥವಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಅದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹನ್ನೆರಡನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ 'The departmental requirements under this head were reduced at the time of finalisation of the Budget proposals for 1957-58' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ reduced ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನಿದೆ? ಹಿಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಇಳಿತಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಬೇಡಿಕೆ (demand) ಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೂ ಇರಕೂಡದು. ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ತಯಾರಿಸುವಾಗ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದು ಈಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅನೇಕ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳಾದಾಗ ಹೊಸಯೋಜನೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ವಿವರಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೆವು, ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಹೊಸ ಯೋಜನೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಇಷ್ಟ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಂದಾಜಾಗಿದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಯಾವ ಅಂಶವೂ ಹೊರಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ 29ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪ್ಪಂದ ನದಿ, ಕಲ್ಯಾಣಪುರ ನದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಬುಕ್ಕಲ್ ನದಿ, ಇವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರು ಹೊಸ ಸೇತುವೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಟೋಕನ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಟೋಕನ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಚಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ಮೂರನೆಯ ವಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವೇನಿತ್ತು? ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸಾಲಾಖೈರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 15 ದಿನಗಳು ಇರುವಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಟೋಕನ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವ ಅಂಕಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಣವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಲು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದೊಂದನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ ಏಕದಂ ನುಂಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವುದು ತುಂಬ ವಿಷಾದಕರವಾದುದು. ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಿತ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ; ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವಂತೆ ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನ ನಾನಾ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ 205ರ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಅವರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇದು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ನಾನಾ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಧೋರಣೆ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟಿನ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ 3,34,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಹೋದಸಾರಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಸಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾದೀತು ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದಂತಾದೀತು ಎಂಬಂಶವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರವೆಂದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇಂಥ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಸಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನುಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಹತ್ತನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ 20,00,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷ ಅಂದಾಜುಮಾಡಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ನಮೂದುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಣ ಕೆರೆಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥಾ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಥವಾ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವಾಗ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹೇಗಿತ್ತು; ಯಾವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಟೀಕೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ಇನ್ನು ಉಳಿತಾಯದ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೇವಲ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಇಡೀ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿತಾಯದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೆಜಿಟಿಯರ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸೆನ್‌ಸಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈಗಲೂ ಇದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಮಿಗಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಕೂಡ 1960ನೆಯ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆನ್‌ಸಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತೀಕ್ಷ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದಂಥ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನೇ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದುಡ್ಡು ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

18ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ 1,68,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಸಂತೋಷ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಭಾಗ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ತೋರಿಸದೆ T.A., D.A. ಕಂಟಿನ್‌ಜೆನ್‌ಸಿಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ್ ಚಾರ್ಜಸ್‌ಗೆ ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾವು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ? ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನಮೇಲೆ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನಮೇಲೆ ಆದಾಯ ಖರ್ಚು ಬಾಬಿನಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಯಾವತರಹವಾದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇದೆಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ತನ್ನ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನಮೇಲೆ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳು ಇರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೊಗುಂಆಗಿ ಅನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿತ ಬಾಬುಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ನಿಖರವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ದುಡ್ಡು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ನೌಕರರಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ನೌಕರರವರೆಗೆ ಅತೃಪ್ತಿ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸದ ಕೂಗು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಇದೆ. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಇವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಂದು ನೈತಿಕಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ವೇತನ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳು ಸರ್ವಸಾಧಾರಣವಾದ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆಇರುವುದೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಟೋಕನ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ತೃಪ್ತಿ ಬಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

24ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹರಿಜನರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಬಂದಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರದ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿಯಿಂದ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಭಾಷಣದ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಮಿತ್ರರ ಅನುಭವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಂಚು ಹಂಚಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬಾಗಿಲು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಗೋಡೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ, ಅಷ್ಟು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಲುಪದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಂಚದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ, ಒಂದು ಗುರಿ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಜಯಪ್ರದ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ, ಅದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಜೆಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಕೇವಲ ನಾನು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೊಡುವ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅನೇಕ ಮಹನೀಯರು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಂ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳಿಂದ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸಲು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಯಾವತರಹದ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸಜೆಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಹಂಚುವುದರಲ್ಲೇ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ದುಡ್ಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗುರಿ ನೆರವೇರುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾರ್ಚಿ, ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡದೆ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಆ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗಿ ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ದುಡ್ಡು ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. 4–6 ಅಂಗುಲ ಗೋಡೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮಳೆ ಬಂದು ಗೋಡೆಗಳು ಬಿದ್ದುಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಅನಾಹುತಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ, ವೀರರಾಜಪುರ, ಕನ್ನೇರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಈ ಊರುಗಳ ಹರಿಜನರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕೇರಿಗೂ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಗೋಡೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷವಾದರೂ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ.

ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಒಡ್ಡರ ಪಾಳ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆರು ಸಂಸಾರಗಳವರು ಗೋಡೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದರೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಿನಿಯೋಗಮಾಡದೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸ ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ನಿಗಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

25ನೆಯ ಹೆಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಲಿನ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಲಿನ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ? ಯಾವ ಏಜೆನ್ಸಿಯಿಂದ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ? ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. 39 ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಮೂಲಕ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡವುದು ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಒಂದು "ನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್" ಇದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅನೇಕ ಮೈಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ದುಡ್ಡುಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. 1957–58 ನೆಯ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ಭಾಗದ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಅಡಕ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸ್ಯಾಂಕ್ಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಆಧಾರವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬಹು ಭಾಗದ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. 32 ನೆಯ ಹೆಡ್ಡಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಈ ರಿಪೇರಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಸ್ಕೀಮುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು "for adjusting the net loss in the transactions relating to the sale of of rice in scarcity areas in Mysore Division—ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೂ ದುಡ್ಡುಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

5 P.M.

ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿನಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹ ಸಂಕೋಚದಿಂದ ಹಿಂಜರಿಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 17ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ದುಡ್ಡು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಒದಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. "Item No. 6. For meeting the arrears of power charges. An Expenditure of Rs. 63,774 according to Departmental figures against a provision of Rs. 1,74,000 has been incurred up to the end of October 1957" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕು? ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಯಿತು? ಏಕೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಯಿತು? ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿತವಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟೆ, ಕಾಲುವೆ, ಕೆರೆ ಒಡೆದು ಹೋಯಿತು ಎಂದು P.W.D. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಡೆ ಎಂಥೆಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ನಡೆದಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನೀರು ಹರಿದು ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರಿಯೇ? ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಾಗ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಆಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಶಾದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೊಂದು ಅನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿತ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಖರ್ಚಿನ ಬಾಬುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷ ಎಂದರೆ 1957-58ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುವಾಗ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ದುಡ್ಡು ವ್ಯಯ ಆಗದಂತೆ ದುಡ್ಡಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹತೋಟಿಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ತಯಾರ್‌ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಂಕೋಚವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮೊನ್ನೆಯ ದಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ದಿನ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಹಾಗು ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕಾರ್ಯ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸವೇ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲೆ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಜಾಯಿಷಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಸ್ವಭಾವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ, ತನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಕಡೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಉದಾಸೀನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ, ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮರೆಯಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತಮ ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪನವರು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಹೊಸಬರೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅವರು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಭವ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸಿ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಶಿರಸಾ ವಹಿಸಿ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪನವರು ಬಹಳ ಅನುಭವ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅನುಭವವಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಲೆಬಾಗಿ ಶಿರಸಾವಹಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅವರ ಟೀಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಯಾರೇ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದೇ. ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರು ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೆಳ್ಳಾ ಕಾಲುವೆ ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ 10 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದು ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಹ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Sir, it has nothing to do with the Board. It is out of the fund of the sugarcane cess that....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಕಬ್ಬಿನ ಸುಂಕವನ್ನು ನಿಧಿಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಶೇಖರಿಸಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಮುಂತಾದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಏರ್ಪಾಡ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರಕಾರ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಆಲೋಚಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಬ್ಬಿನ ಸುಂಕವನ್ನು ನಿಧಿಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಶೇಖರಿಸಿ ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಆ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ನಾಗನಗೌಡರವರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ತೆಲಗಿಯ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಎರಡು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 30ನೆಯ ಮೈಲಿ ಹತ್ತಿರವಿರುವ ಸೇತುವೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನಿತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲವು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಈಚೆಗೆ ನಾನು ತರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರಿಪೇರಿಗಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ರಿಪೇರಿ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ, ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗಿದೆಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಖರ್ಚಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಡಿಟ್ ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಅನುಮಾನಾಸ್ಪದವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡುವ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉದಾಸೀನತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯಲಾರದೆಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಆಡಿಟ್ ಸಹ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಊಹೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಪೋಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆದಿದೆ, ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಪತ್ರ ಆಡಿಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಜನರ ಸಹಕಾರ ಅಗತ್ಯ, ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ನೆರವು ಆವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸ ಉನ್ನತ ಪದವಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಕೆರೆಗಳು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೊಳಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗ ರೈತರು ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷೇ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೆರೆ ಕೋಳೆಯಾದಾಗ ಮೀನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಏಕರೇಜ್ ಸೆಸ್ ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಂದ ಮೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಏಕರೇಜ್ ಸೆಸ್ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತಾವೇ ಕೆರೆಯ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿ 'ನೀವೇ ಮಾಡಿ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಒಂದುಕಡೆ ಕೆರೆ ಒಡೆದು ನೀರು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಹದಿನಾರು ಊರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೇ ಹೊರತು ನೀರು ಹೋದರೆ ತಮಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಯಾರೂ ಮಣ್ಣು ಸಹ ಹಾಕಲಿಲ್ಲ; ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ಆ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಲಿ ಎಂದು ಜನ ಉದಾಸೀನರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಉತ್ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷೆಯೇನಲ್ಲ. ಕೆರೆ ಒಡೆದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೆರೆಯ ನೀರು ಹೋದರೆ ನಾವು ಮುಳುಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಕೂಡ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರಿಪೇರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅಂದಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಜನರ ಸಹಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಸಹಕಾರ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಜನರ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಇನ್ನು 29ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಐಟಂ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಮಳೆಯಿಂದ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾವೇರಿ ಸರ್ಕಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಆರು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಟ್ಟು 25 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಣ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಕಂಡರೂ ಊಹೆ ಮಾಡುವಷ್ಟು ಅಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೋಡ್ ಸೆಸ್ ಮೊಂತಾದ ಸೆಸ್ ಹಣಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ರಿಪೇರಿಗಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ತತ್ವವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ವಿಷಯ, ಬರಬಹ ದಾದ ರೋಡ್ ಸೆಸ್ ಮೊಂತಾದುವುಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಎಲ್ಲಾ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅದರಿಂದ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. Repairs of a particular type ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಬರಿಯ ವೆಹಿಕಲ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. We must fix the proportion between the amount of vehicles tax recovered and the amount that is set apart out of that for repairs of a particular road.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗಬಹುದು. ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ರಿಪೇರ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—29ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಐಟಂ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದ ವಿವರ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಕೋಸ್ಟ್ ರಸ್ತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಮೂರು ಸೇತುವೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಹಣವು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಾಬತು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—May I invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to page 13, item 3 ? That has nothing to do with the grant from the Government of India. It is stated that the expenditure could be met by reappropriation. So this is not a case in which the Government is expecting any grant from the Government of India. The Hon'ble the Minister has himself said in the explanatory note that the "provision could be met by reappropriation of sanctioned grants".

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—This relates to column 3, item III Bridges-5, Schemes financed from Union Funds for the development of West Coast Roads.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What I am asking for is this. In respect of item No. 3 of the Explanatory Note, what is the amount required ? Why is it that this amount is not stated here ? The Hon'ble Minister is asking for a demand without mentioning the amount. Is there any estimate ? He is asking only for a token grant. So I want to know the estimate.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—When I explained this particular item, the Hon'ble member was not in the House. The estimates for all these bridges have been prepared and they have been sanctioned. The Government of India have to meet this expenditure and they have agreed to do so. So only a token grant of Rs. 100 is asked for in order to bring this to the notice of the House and to take its sanction for these works. If the Hon'ble member wants, I shall give the detailed estimates of these bridges. The construction of the bridge over the Uppanda River on the West Coast is estimated to cost Rs. 8·15 lakhs. The construction of the bridge over the Kalyanapur River on the West Coast is estimated to cost Rs. 13·38 lakhs and the construction of the bridge over the Mabukkal River on the West Coast is estimated to cost Rs. 21·52 lakhs.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Hon'ble Minister kindly read the note in his copy ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, may I be permitted to intervene. I know something about this particular item. These three bridges were sanctioned after the budget for 1957-58 was passed by the House and, therefore, they could not have been foreseen and provided for in the budget. The entire expenditure of these three bridges is met by the Centre and so the to kengrant that is asked for here is only to bring to the notice of this House the fact that these three bridges have been sanctioned by the Centre and the expenditure could be met by reappropriation on receiving the grant from the Centre. So the finances of this State are not committed in any way. That is why only a token grant is asked for so that members may express their opinion on these works.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The elaborate and lucid explanation given by the Hon'ble Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs takes me nowhere. I may refer to what is there in cold print in the statement before us. What he now says is there and so I want to know which is correct.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—May I read the relevant entry at page 13 under Demand No. 29? Under column 3, this is what is stated: "III-Bridges-5, Schemes financed from Union Funds for the development of West Coast Roads". I may remind the Hon'ble member that these bridges are on the West Coast Roads.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Hon'ble Minister kindly read the explanatory note to item 3?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am coming to that in order. This is what the note to item 3 says: "Three works, *viz.*, Construction of Bridges across (1) Uppanda River, (2) Kalyanapur River, and (3) Mabukkal River in South Kanara District have been since sanctioned." I emphasise the word 'since'. So they could not have been included in the Budget. The note further says "the provision could be met by reappropriation of sanctioned grants." So it is a question only of reappropriation of the grants from the Centre and nothing more. The note further says: "as they are items of new service, a token grant of Rs. 100 is required."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In fact, I may definitely tell the House and Mr. Speaker that I am not convinced of this explanation. If the Government of India have sanctioned for a specific purpose, then where is the need for reappropriation? For what purpose it was sanctioned and why it should be reappropriated is my point. The question of reappropriation arises when the grant is made for one purpose and the amount is sought to be spent for some other purpose.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, with the permission of the Speaker, let me intervene. There is a lot of force in what Sri Mallaradhya says. The provision is made for the west coast road. But for three specific items, there was no provision. Therefore it is a 'new service,' and we have asked a token grant of Rs. 100. When the amount is received from the Government of India, we reappropriate the money and utilise the money. The explanation is correct. I think the Hon'ble Member is satisfied.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am still not convinced, Sir.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have made the provision for West Coast Road, but there was no specific provision for these bridges. Now that these bridges have been sanctioned, we have brought this Demand for a token grant so that the Legislature can be kept informed and so that we can pay the Bills if and when they are received. West Coast Road has already been provided for. For these bridges, there was no provision. They are all small bridges.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why did they not provide for these bridges? Any how, I do not want to pursue, Sir. But I would invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to this point; I request him to look into the matters. There is something wrong, or it will be necessary to give a little more clarification.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It will be looked into.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—'ಅಪ್ರೋಚ್' ರೋಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಕೇಳಿದರು. 32ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅಪ್ರೋಚ್ ರೋಡ್‌ಗಳ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೆ ಎಂದೂ ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದರು. Famine Relief works ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ; ತಪ್ಪೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ.

42ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ (5) ನೆಯ ಬಾಬಿನ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸುತ್ತ frequency Conversion ಹೊಸದೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ; ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಇಂಥಿಂಥಾ ಕಡೆ frequency conversion ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನಮಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬಿಲ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ವಾಣೀವಿಲಾಸ ವಾಟರ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ frequency conversion ಮಾಡಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಬೇಕಾಯಿತು.

ಥ್ಯಾಕರ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯ ದರವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ ಮೊದಲಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಚಾರ್ಜು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ಆದರೆ 11 ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಮೊದಲಿನ ದರದಂತೆಯೇ ಕೋಲಾರ ಚಿನ್ನದ ಗಣಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ ವಿದ್ಯು

ಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ವರ್ಷವರ್ಷವೂ ರಿಪೇರಿಗಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಎಂಥ ಮಳೆ ಬಂದರೂ ಇಂಥ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ತಜ್ಞರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ......

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By way of explanation. My objection was that year after year the Government is spending 8 to 10 lakhs of rupees towards damages caused by heavy rains in respect of Visveswaraya cannal. If they only capitalise the expenditure they can do something substantial. What is it that they propose to do? That is what I asked. Have they got on idea as to what is spent so far? Every year, it is a hardy annual.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಇಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. But it cannot be altogether avoided ಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

42ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 11ನೆಯ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ, ಪೈಪ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಕ್ಯಾಸ್ಟ್ ಐರನ್ ಪೈಪುಗಳು ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ಟೀಲ್ ಪೈಪ್ ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ತರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಾಲಾತೀತವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಭದ್ರಾವತಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರು. ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು details for new items ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂತನ್‌ಕರ್ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ವಿವರಣೆಯೊಡನೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಅದೇ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಸ್ತಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನಾದರೂ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಬಹುದೇ ಹೊರತು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, newly integrated ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಆರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು, ಅದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವಹಾಗೆ, ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಹತ್ತಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿದ್ದುವು. ಅಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನೇ ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೋ ಏನೋ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Will the Hon'ble Minister speak in English? I do not understand him.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—The Hon'ble Member can understand Kannada, Sir.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—May I tell honestly? I did not understand the Minister. I know a bit of Kannada. I can understand very little of Kannada.

5-30 P.M.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member said that the newly integrated areas were being neglected. That is not a fact. When he made that remark, the background seems to be the language question.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—That is the feeling generally about the integrated areas.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I know Sir, that some of the works there were pending for 8 or 10 or 12 years. Works are being expedited, money is being spent and they are in progress. Therefore, his accusation that the integrated areas generally are neglected is far from truth. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಖೋತ್ ಅವರು ದೂದ್ ಗಂಗಾ ನದಿಗೆ ಸೇತುವೆ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿವರಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ, ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಥೆಯೇ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೊ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿನ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಟರಿ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತಹ ಟೀಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಳಿ ಅವರು ಸಮಾಧಾನರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆರೆಯ ಕೋಡಿ, ತೂಬು ರಿಪೇರಿಗಳು ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಚಿವರು ಏನೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಂತಹ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳು ಯಾವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಕೆರೆಯ ತೂಬು, ಕೋಡಿ ರಿಪೇರಿಗಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು 10-12 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ, ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳು ವಾಪಸ್ಸಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈನರ್ ಕೆರೆಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿಗಾಗಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮೈನರ್ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಕೀಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆರೆಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, regarding the question raised by the Hon'ble Member, I would state that he seems to be under a wrong impression. It is true that in the past annewari was made by only eye inspection, but recently the Government have introduced the random sampling crop cutting experiment and now annewari is fixed on the basis of the crop cutting experiments and not by eye inspection and therefore there is no question of making annewari either more or less than what it is.

Regarding Demand No. 2, there are two items in it-remuneration to Shanbhogues and Patels and Kanungo Establishment. It seems the word 'Kanungo Establishment' has created a lot of misunderstanding to the Hon'ble Members. I have already explained the word and it means the establishment of Circle Inspectors and the staff which is meant for inspecting the village records. As a matter of fact, this item ought to have been included in the budget, but by oversight it was not included. I would like to bring to the notice of members that the State was reorganised in the month of November and the Divisional Commissioner's Office was opened just at that time and therefore by oversight this item was not included in the budget. In future care will be taken to see that such items are included in the budget.

Regarding the remuneration of Shanbhogues and Patels, I have already explained that this supplementary Demand is due to increase in the allowance of the village officers. The Government took the decision to increase their allowances after the budget was passed and therefore the Divisional Commissioners have asked for these supplementary grants. This could not have been anticipated at the time of the budget.

Regarding Demand No. 38, improvement of gomal, it is said that as it is a new service it ought to have been included in the budget and that there was no hurry to include it in the supplementary Demands. In this case I agree that it could be included in the budget but the point is that if the gomals are to be improved, some procedure has to be evolved before the rainy season. I request the Hon'ble Members to read this scheme and then they will realise why the decision had to be taken early and it had to be included in the supplementary Demands. The Government has sanctioned a scheme under which the village panchayats will be given Rs. 150 per acre for the improvement of gomal. The village panchayats with the help of the villagers are to dig the trenches round about the block, put manure, plough, etc. All these operations are to be ready by monsoon so that when the monsoon starts the seed grass will be sown and the grass will be grown. With that view, all this procedure has to be gone through. It was necessary to sanction this scheme immediately. If this scheme was to be included in the budget, there would not be sufficient time to take up this scheme this year and it would have been postponed to the next year. That is the only reason why this scheme has been sanctioned in this supplementary Demand. Otherwise, there was no other reason.

The Hon'ble Member Dr. Nagan Gowda raised the question of token grant. It is true that it is now a token grant and adequate provision has been made in the budget and more money is necessary for this scheme. There is no doubt about it. It is only a token grant. Excepting that practically no funds will be spent by the end of March. Regarding this it was said that it was a new service and a question of policy. As a matter of fact, this is not a question of policy and this is not an entirely new scheme. If the Minister

was in the erstwhile Mysore Government service, he must be knowing that the old Mysore Government had issued a number of circulars for the improvement of gomal. Of course, there is some difference in respect of details, but the improvement of the gomal was one of the schemes which the erstwhile Mysore Government had undertaken. Similarly the Bombay Government had issued circulars for the improvement of gomal. Apart from that, even in the Five Year Plan there is a scheme for the improvement of the grass lands and therefore, this scheme is not a new scheme at all and this question is not a question of policy. The policy has already been determined long ago and this has been accepted not only in our State but in all the other States.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chiknaikanahalli).—Is it done through the agency of the Agriculture Department?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Gomals are under the control of the Revenue Department and therefore, the scheme is sanctioned by the Revenue Department.

Regarding Demand No. 57, the necessity of demanding this amount arose as the Government decided to purchase paddy in the month of December. As the House knows, upto this time, the Government of India used to supply rice to us for running fair price shops, but they stopped supplying rice from the month of February and we had to think over whether we should purchase rice independently or we should depend upon the Government of India. We carried on correspondence with the Government of India and the Government of India flatly said that as the Southern Zone was formed and as the Southern Zone was self-sufficient in the matter of rice, the Government of India was not prepared to supply rice at all and that, if any State Government wanted any paddy or rice for their purpose, they should purchase independently. After we received this reply. this Government considered this question and decided to purchase paddy That decision was taken in the month of December and therefore, provision was to be made for the purpose of purchasing paddy. In this connection, Mr. Sunthankar complained that the price fixed for paddy by Government was not adequate. As a matter of fact, the Government of Mysore has not fixed the rate of paddy at all. We have decided to purchase paddy at the rate prevailing in the market and we are following that policy throughout our State. We have not fixed any rate and therefore the question whether it is adequate or not does not arise at all. Regarding the Southern Zone, Mr. Sunthankar may be of the opinion that the Zone is not desirable because I know that he is interested more in the Bombay State or Maharashtra than in the Mysore State. Apart from that, I am not of that opinion. On the other hand, I have definitely said that the Southern Zone is in the interests of our State and therefore, the Southern Zone is necessary, But at the same time I have said that as we expected, as both the Government of India and the State Governments concerned expected, the rice was not moving to our expectation from Andhra to Madras or to Mysore; it is a fact, but that does not mean I am against the Southern Zone. That was the position a few months ago. Recently rice is moving from Andhra to the Mysore State in a larger quantity and I hope our needs will be met by the Andhra State. As I said, earlier the Southern Zone is really in the interests of our State. If the Southern Zone had not been there, I am quite sure that the rates which are reasonable to-day would have risen and we would have had to open more fair price shops and it would have been very difficult for us to supply rice to the people and under the circumstances it will be seen. . . .

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But the point raised by me in respect of Demand No. 38 was that it was a scheme included in the Second Five-Year Plan. It is not as if the improvement of gomal in Mysore State was not there in the previous administration. But this is a new policy and scheme which has been inaugurated by the Honourable Revenue Minister. When there was the Second

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Five-Year Plan, where was necessity for including it in the supplementary Demands ? It could as well have been included in the Second Five-Year Plan. At no time the Government had taken over the management and improvement of gomal land to be entrusted to village panchayats. There was no circular issued in this behalf, but what I objected to was that even if they accepted this question of policy on the ground that it was a scheme under the Second Five-Year Plan, there was no point in saying that this expenditure was not foreseen. They could have included it in the Second Five-Year Plan and got a larger amount.

In respect of Demand No. 57 I said that on the date that the Government incurred Rs. 1,18,00,000 what was the amount at the credit of the Contingency Fund ? To-day the Accountant General has not given the details under three major heads–Consolidated Fund Contingency Fund and Public Account. I want to know that on the date that the Government incurred Rs. 1,18,00,000 what was the amountat credit of Contingency Fund ? Was there a legal sanction behind it ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I did not say that that particular scheme was included in the Five-Year Plan. The improvement of grazing lands is under the Five-Year Plan; it is part of that scheme. I said that the erstwhile Mysore Government also had such a scheme; I said, as far as the details are concerned, they are not the same; the original scheme was different. This scheme differs in some details. This is a different matter. But this is not a new policy. The Hon'ble Member is raising the question whether it is a new policy at all. It is not a question of new policy. He can say that it is a separate scheme, but the policy as such is the same which the old Mysore Government had followed and which the Government of India also are following and which the Planning Commission has laid down. So it is not a question of new policy at all. Regarding the amounts spent from the Contingency Fund, the details are given in the Explanatory Note under Demand No. 57 :

"The Scheme of voluntary procurement of paddy was accorded sanction in the latter part of the year 1957. To implement this scheme, a sum of Rs. 118 lakhs is necessary. This sum was advanced from the Contingency Fund in two stages of Rs. 25 lakhs and Rs. 93 lakhs. The present Demand is to recoup the advances made out of the Contingency Fund."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My objection was that at the time the Government incurred the expenditure of 1,18,00,000 where was the contingency fund of that magnitude ? They had only a crore of rupees and where did they get Rs. 118 lakhs ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.–I think the Hon'ble Member may be aware that because the Contingency Fund was not sufficient, the ordinance was issued and the amount of the Contingency Fund was increased.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—On what date the expenditure for procurement of paddy was incurred ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The ordinance was issued on the 5th February 1958 and the paddy was being purchased from the 25th January, but there were also funds—Rs. 50 lakhs under this item and the amount was spent from that item. After the ordinance was issued, the amount was spent from the Contingency Fund.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What the Minister said is not clear to me. The specific point raised by me was that when the Government actually incurred this expenditure to the tune of Rs. 118 lakhs, what was the amount to the credit of the Contingency Fund ? Did they have proper sanction behind it ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The proper sanction was given and the amount was spent according to the sanction. There was no irregularity.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But on what dates the expenditure was incurred ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The ordinance was issued on the 5th February and the expenditure was incurred in the Districts ; I shall have to get the dates.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—Crop cutting experiment ಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಫಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಲು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ನಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗೆರೆ ಎಳೆದು ಅವುಗಳ ಮಧ್ಯೇ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು experiments ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The crop cutting experiment islaid down by statistics. It is accepted by all. I could not exactly understand what the Hon'ble member wants.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—How long this has been in force ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I think the crop cutting experiment system is in vogue in the old Mysore for the last 4 to 5 years.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Hon'ble Minister was speaking of the southern zone. Is it not a fact that on account of establishment, the price of jawar has come down because of the restrictions imposed ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I cannot say whether they have come down or gone up. It is reasonable.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ತನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಸಾವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆ, ಇಷ್ಟು ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತೊಂಬತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯೂ ದೊರೆತಿದೆ. ಆಗಿನ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು 19 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಹೊಸ ಪ್ರಾಂತವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡಗಳವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೊಡನೆ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಸಿ, ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ವತಃ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಸಹಾಯಧನವನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಆರು ಲಕ್ಷ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಆರು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವರು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್-ಇನ್-ಏಡ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಈ ಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ದೊರೆಕಿದ್ದು ಕಳೆದ ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ. ಅವರಿಂದ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ಬಂದಕೂಡಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಹಂಚಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಲು ವಿಳಂಬವಾಯಿತು. ನಮಗೆ ವಿಳಂಬ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಸರ್ವಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ, ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕೆಲವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಗೋಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ದೂರುಗಳು ನನಗೂ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಊರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಹಾಯ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಒಂದೇ ಸಲ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅನಂತರ ಬೇರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಹೋಗೋಣವೆಂದರೆ ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಹಂಚಿ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಬಹಳಕಾಲವಾಗಬಹುದು, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬಂದಷ್ಟು ಬರಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹಂಚಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಿನಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆವು. ಗೋಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅನೇಕರು ಕಾದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಣ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಗೋಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಗೋಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಂತೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಗೋಡೆಗಳು ಒಂದು ಎತ್ತರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಕೊಡುವುದು. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಗೋಡೆಹಾಕಿ ಕಾದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ! ಒಂದುವರ್ಷ, ಆರುತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಿಂದೀಚೆಗೆ ಗೋಡೆಹಾಕಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ತಪ್ಪು. ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಕಾದಿದ್ದವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಗೋಡೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ, ಹಂಚಿಕೆಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗೋಡೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರು ಯಾರೋ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಹಣ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗಿರುವುದು.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂತು. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆ ನೀವುಗಳು ಗೋಡೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಗೋಡೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬಹುದು. . . . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ದುಡ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಹಂಚಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆಯಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಪ್ರತಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರುಗಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರು ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಿ ಹಂಚಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಿ ಹಂಚಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹೌದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲರ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ consult ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವೇ ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರತಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೂ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಊಹೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಲ್ಲ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಆಯಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಆಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೂ ಆಯಾ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರು ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರತಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹರಿಜನರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ದಾಮಾಷಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ದುಡ್ಡು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ. . . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳಲಿ ? ನಾನು ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿರುವ ದುಡ್ಡು ಇವುಗಳ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಮತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸೋಣ. ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸಹ ದೂರುಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಒಬ್ಬರಮೇಲೆ ದೂರು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದು ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಮೇಲೆ ದೂರು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

6 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಜಮೀನು ಅಕ್ವಿಜಿಷನ್ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳು ಬಹಳ ತಡವಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಬೇಗ ನಡೆಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಅಂಶ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಹಣ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿನಿಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I want to know whether there are not instances of special grant earmarked for particular places in particular taluks.

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಥಾ ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳೊದಗಿದಾಗ ಎಂದರೆ ಆಕಸ್ಮಿಕ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಅನಾಹುತಗಳು, ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕೇರಿಯನ್ನೇ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದುಕಡೆಗೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿಮಾತ್ರ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿದ್ದಾಗ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Not when there are special considerations. Are there not instances of special grants direct from Government to particular villages in particular taluks ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಂಥ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಸರ್‌ಕಂಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸಸ್‌ಗಳಿದ್ದರೇ ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಾರಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಬರಲು ಕೊಂಚ ನಿಧಾನವಾಯಿತು. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಈ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಸಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಂಚಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಡವಾಯಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಬಸವಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ—ನಿಮ್ನ ಪಂಗಡ).—ಈಗತಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಆರುಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಬಂದಿತು ಅಧಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆರುಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಮಾಡಿದೆವು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬಂತು ? ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಹಂಚಿದರು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಚೆನ್ನಿಗರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂತು. ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಅದೇ ಜನವರಿ 16 ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಅದನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I raised a point in connection with this grant. A number of matching grants are being given, and I wanted the Government of Mysore to take this question with the Central Government. Instead of treating these grants as matching grants, they must be treated as block grants. It may be very difficult for us to find the necessary funds. Further it is a question of prestige for this Government. When a number of State Governments are taking advantage of these matching grants, why this particular Government should not take it? A time may come when it may be far beyond our capacity to even get the advantage of such matching grants. In view of this, I suggested that this matter might be taken up with the Government of India and particularly in respect of Scheduled classes, this grant might be treated as outright grants and not matching grants.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—We will take note of the suggestion.

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA.—With regard to Demand No. 25, the Bangalore Milk Supply Scheme, one of the Hon'ble Members asked why this expenditure was not foreseen and included in the usual budget. I would like to inform the House that though the scheme was included in the Second Five-Year Plan, we thought that it would not be possible to implement the scheme in 1957-58 itself for the simple reason that we would have had to import machinery and equipment from foreign countries. Later on, on account of shortage of foreign exchange and the difficulty in obtaining machinery from abroad, we thought we could get the help of the Indian Dairy Farm. In the month of October or so, we got the acceptance of the Indian Dairy Farm to help us in the pasteurisation of milk. I must express my thanks to the Indian Dairy Farm for this offer of help. In view of this we decided to take up this scheme without further delay. Thus, this could not be foreseen at the time the budget was framed. This amount was absorbed from the Contingency Fund and has now been placed before the House for recoupment.

Another point raised by Hon'ble Member was how this milk supply was going to be arranged. There was also a suggestion that the co-operative movement should be encouraged in this respect. I would humbly submit that milk is usually purchased from the Milk Co-operative Union, which is being adequately encouraged by us. The milk to be pasteurised would be bought from the Milk Co-operative Union. Therefore the suggestion made by the Hon'ble Member is being adopted by the Government.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Matters have been so thoroughly discussed and very valuable suggestions made, that I do not propose to take a long time.

Sir, the definition of "New Services" has been asked. Much of the debate that took place would not have arisen, if I had been permitted to explain things at the very outset. The rules governing the Contingency Fund have to be framed by the Public Accounts Committee. The rules have not been framed so far and the Accountant General has laid down that the rules in force in the old Mysore State will govern the definition of 'New Service'. Apart from that, one thing that is very clear is that New Service is one that is not contemplated at the time the budget is framed because at the time the budget is being framed, it will be impossible to have a precise idea of all the expenditure that would arise during the course of the year.

Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO (Kaup).—The Public Accounts Committee had never been called to meet, although it has been formed.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Whatever it is, the fact remains that the rules have not been framed to govern the Contingency Fund. Rules 4 and 6 of old Mysore specifically provide the scope of 'New Service', the particulars needed, and how it is to be asked for. Apart from this, new service is something which has not been contemplated at the time of framing the budget. It is well-known that the budget is always for future expenditure and therefore an element of uncertainty

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

attendant on futurity is always there. Presentation of supplementary Demands is not an innovation to this State. It has been provided for in the Constitution. It is to afford the House a chance to express its views on the Demands, that they have been placed before the House. Supplementary Demands have been asked for in the past and such a method exists not only in this State but in others also.

Sir, it was mentioned that a very large Demand, as much as 4 crores, has been asked for and it looks as though 4 crores is something which should frighten the House. If we consider the figures given on page 12, it might be seen under item No. 57—Capital Outlay on State Schemes of Government Trading—2 crores have been provided. This is with regard to purchase of paddy which was not foreseen at the time the budget was framed. Again on the same page, Demand No. 57-A—"Appropriation to the Contingency Fund" involving a crore of rupees, is only a book adjustment, not even an actual expenditure. Thus these two items entail more than 3 crores of rupees. There is another item Demand No. 58 which relates to "Loans and Advances by State Government", involving a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs. That is the advance made to the Electricity Board. The Board had not been constituted at the time the budget was framed. It has been stated as to why this expenditure could not be anticipated. Sir, how can we make a provision for the Board, when the Board itself had not been constituted. There seems to be a slight fallacy in such an argument. Unless the schemes are precisely formulated and the exact amounts are asked for and provided for.....

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There was no objection taken on the floor of this House with regard to Rs. 50 lakhs given to the Electricity Board and we at once saw the appropriateness of the expenditure and agreed to it.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I thank the Hon'ble Member for the enlightenment rendered. But I did hear the Members questioning why Rs. 4 crores expentiture was not thought of.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Reference has not has been made to it.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am not answering one individual member. I have to deal with the criticisms of Members collectively. In that light, I was saying that nobody need object to the items that are dealt with now. I may mention that the bulk of Rs. 50 lakhs has been repaid. These are contingencies which we cannot expect. Sir, regard to the Medical College at Hubli, it could not have been foreseen and provided for at that time. Various things have happened after the presentation of the Budget. (*Interruption.*) Unless my friends make a study of the Estimates in greater detail to interject and say all they want to say and try to disturb me, I don't think by that any purpose will be served. There are various items I can point out one after another which will cover practically 85 per cent of the amounts that are now asked for and could not have been foreseen. There is one particular item which I myself have to deal with because I am in charge of that portfolio. That is on page 7, Demand No. 18 regarding Ports. Sir, it was not known at the time when the State was reorganised. Till then, there was no port for the Mysore State and the Port Department is a new Department which came into existence. Tentatively a certain amount was provided for and a Port Officer was appointed. He gave certain details and amounts for Ports Establishment have been provided now. Sir, I have to answer one particular point which was made with regard to item 5, Other charges for which Rs. 60,600 have been provided. I have ascertained what exactly that was. It is with regard to various tools that have got to be provided to 27 ports in the State. Sir, in that light it is absolutely impossible to provide for particular purchases to be made with regard to particular items that were required and that is why a lumpsum grant has been made. Sir, I might also at this stage say that it should not be taken that these amounts have already been spent,

These are monies to be provided for payments which are likely to be made by the Government on or before 31st March 1958, and those Bills are yet to come. At the time when these estimates were prepared, it will be seen that certain Bills were yet arriving. Therefore, a lumpsum amount has been asked for to meet such contingencies since there is no chance of placing a demand before the House at a later stage. That is why these estimates have been brought and that is why these estimates have been presented. I must not fail to refer to a particular point mentioned by Dr. Nagan Gowda regarding the Bureau of Mineral Development and especially the exploitation of resources and particularly to iron ore exploitation which is taking a very fine shape. I am very happy to inform the House that the exploitation of iron ore envisages a very bright future for the State. I may say that many foreign firms are competing in coming forward with offers of equipment or money. I am not in a position now to give further details beyond saying that the suggestion thrown out by Dr. Nagan Gowda is one which is receiving the attention of the State Government. As already submitted, the State Government schemes worth about Rs. 20 crores are likely to be accepted to a very large extent and they take some time before they could fructify. They are in the pro ess of being exploited by the Government. It is in that light a token estimate has been placed for a very very small amount and it is perhaps for years to come we will get assistance from the Central Government to develop them to a very large extent.

Sir, Government is fully aware of the vast resources that are found in the State of Mysore and those resources are going to be exploited and there is absolutely no doubt that the State would stand to gain by this. Incidentally, it may be said that the Mining Department is very likely to be reorganised and further expenses will have to be incurred. Sir, there are various other expenditures that could not have been possibly foreseen because Government of India grant comes as and when they give. Is it not right to utilise those amounts that come from the Government of India by way of grants and by way of loans? This Government would not be doing the right thing if it did not utilise those amounts and take money from the contingency and carry on the works. If we analyse all these Demands, it could be seen that every one of the schemes is such which could not have been foreseen.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY.—The Revenue Minister was saying that this Government had foreseen all these things and the Hon'ble Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs says that they could not have been foreseen.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, the contradiction is more imaginary than real. If we are saying a certain thing, it does not mean that all these things could have been provided in the Budget nor could it be said that it was known before such works will have to be undertaken. These are circumstances which are feasibly found in every budget. Sir, I refer to "22–Interest on Debt and Other Obligations". It can be seen that what is provided for is with regard to the interest payable in respect of the portion of the debt transferred from Bombay as a consequence of integration. It was done in 1956-57. May I tell the House that details are not yet finalised and have to be finalised and interest will have to be paid as and when they accrue and for that money has got to be provided for? It becomes still more clear if we remember the fact that the loan was floated after the Budget was presented. If it is said that the interest for the loan could have been foreseen and provided for, I fail to understand. Therefore, Sir, if we look at the figures, out of this 4 crores more than 3½ or 3 crores 80 lakhs are something which could not have possibly been provided for. It could also be seen that there has been a slight change particularly, with regard to the bridges in West Coast. Three bridges have been sanctioned. After the Budget has been presented all these are done

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

and amount has been provided for and spent. Now it has been brought before the House so that the attention of the House may be revetted on them. But to say that something is wrong or these could have been foreseen and could have been provided for in the Budget, is not right. All these charges do not stand at all scrutiny and they are not at all to be accepted if they are clearly analysed and understood.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, when the allocation of assets and liabilities of the integrated areas of Bombay was made is not clear. What is this allocation of interest on loans from Bombay? This has not been very clear to us. They say that the question of allocation is pending; then, why make provision for interest when the actual size of the debt is not known ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, 31st March is yet to come. The interest charges of the loans transferred from Bombay for the last five months of 1956-57 expected to be adjusted during that year, but actually passed on for adjustment during the current year was brought to the notice after the presentation of the Budget.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have read it over ten times. My question is, what is the amount of the debt and what is the amount of interest to be paid ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—If all that is wanted is the accurate figure, I shall certainly give it when the Appropriation Bill comes up for discussion, but I may state that the provision that is made is to meet a liability about which there can be no doubt.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My objection is to the appropriateness of making provision for it by a supplementary Demand. We have hardly 15 days to go for the official year to come to a close. When even the details are not available at this late stage, where is the necessity for making provision for it by a supplementary Demand? It could as well have been provided for in the budget for 1958-59 and paid on the 1st of April. The point is very clear. Even then simply statements are being made which do not carry conviction to us. It is not a question of getting the information, but it is a question of principle. Where is the necessity for providing for a certain quantum of interest in respect of a loan the size of which is not known ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Fifteen days period is long enough to disburse the amount. This sum of Rs. 10 lakhs is in respect of liabilities which are evidenced by a contract. It will be seen that even the exact amount of interest is calculated and it is mentioned as Rs. 10,87,000. The debt has been provisionally allotted to this State on population basis and interest on that has to be paid.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I know why this particular item was not included in the revised budget estimates? All the other items that have been provided for in the supplementary estimates have been included in the revised budget estimates.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—That is something which will come up for discussion at the time of the budget discussion.

Sir, there is one more point which I want to deal with, and that is regarding the constitution of labour courts. Much was said with regard to that. I may mention to the satisfaction of the House that two labour courts were sanctioned. Sri Sunthankar was pleased to observe that the enactment had been passed by the Legislature a little earlier. Sir, it is not the passing of the enactment that creates a liability, but the constitution of the courts. The liability arises when provision has to be made for the actual amount of pay and allowances to be disbursed to the officers and staff. Therefore, when the labour courts were constituted money had to be provided for meeting the expenditure. These courts were constituted after the budget was presented and that is why no provision was made in the budget, but there was this liability arising after the presentation of the budget and that was provided for. I will not venture to

answer the criticism that was made with regard to a typewriter in one of the courts.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ (ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಟೀಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಕೃತಜ್ಞತೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಈಗ ನಾವು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಹಣ ಸಾಲದು, ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಭೆಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು, ಎಂದರೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರು ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಏನುಕಾರಣವೋ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸಂಬಳದ ಸ್ಕೇಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿ ಮಂಜೂರುಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಥಿಕಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು, ನಮ್ಮ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾದ ಮೇಲೆ, ನೀಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಪೆನ್ಷನ್‌ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪೆನ್ಷನ್ ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇತರರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಷ್ಟೇ ನಾವು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೋ, ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಣವಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು 16ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನೀವು 10ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯೆ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ 10ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟು ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರಿಂದ ಹಣ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ಹಣದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ 10ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿ 20ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರೇ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವು ಇನ್ನೂಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದೇನಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ 10ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದಷ್ಟು ನಾವು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರೂ ಸಹ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಈಗ ಒದಗಿಸಿರುವ ಹಣ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಷ್ಟು ನಾವು ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ತೃಪ್ತಿಯಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮಗೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಶೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ತೃಪ್ತಿಹೊಂದಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸುವುದೇ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಇತರ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅವರು ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೀತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೇನು ಕಷ್ಟ? ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಿತ್ರರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಲಹೆ ಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ತುಂಬ ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will now put the demands to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the list of Demands circulated to the Members may be granted to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period ending 31st March 1959 in respect of Demands Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 57, 41, 42, 47, 51, 57, 57-A, 58."

The motion was adopted.

[Under the orders of the Deputy Speaker, the motions for demands voted are reproduced as follows:]

DEMAND No. 1—TAXES ON INCOME OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX AND ESTATE DUTY.

4. *Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax and Estate Duty.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 17,300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax and Estate Duty'."

DEMAND No. 2.—LAND REVENUE.

7. *Land Revenue.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,34,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

DEMAND No. 5.—FOREST.

10. *Forest.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 18,57,500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND No. 7—TAXES ON VEHICLES.

12. *Taxes on Vehicles.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Taxes on Vehicles'."

DEMAND No. 8.—OTHER TAXES AND DUTIES.

13. *Other Taxes and Duties.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,68,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March 1958, in respect of 'Other Taxes and Duties'."

DEMAND No. 10.—IRRIGATION.

18. *Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 20,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues'."

DEMAND No. 13.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

25. *General Administration (Except the sub-major heads B and C).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'General Administration (Except the sub-major heads B and C)'."

DEMAND No. 14.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (STATE LEGISLATURE AND ELECTION CHARGES).

25. *General Administration (B. Parliament and the State Legislature and C. Elections).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,32,600 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'General Administration—(State Legislature and Election Charges).'"

DEMAND No. 18—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

30. *Ports and Pilotage.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 68,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND No. 19—SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

36. *Scientific Departments*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Scientific Departments'."

DEMAND No. 20.—EDUCATION.

37. *Education*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Education'."

DEMAND No. 21.—MEDICAL.

38. *Medical*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 19,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Medical'."

DEMAND No. 24.—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

40-*A*. *Rural Development.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 12,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Rural Development'."

DEMAND No. 25—VETERINARY.

41. *Veterinary*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,70,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Veterinary'."

DEMAND No. 27.—INDUSTRIES AND SUPPLIES.

43 *Industries and Supplies.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 4,53,300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Industries and Supplies'."

DEMAND No. 28.—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

47. *Miscellaneous Departments.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

DEMAND No. 29.—CIVIL WORKS.

50. *Civil Works*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 24,33,600 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

DEMAND No. 32—FAMINE RELIEF

54 *Famine.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 15,52,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Famine Relief'."

DEMAND No. 38.—MISCELLANEOUS

57. *Miscellaneous.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 5,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

DEMAND No. 41.—WORKING EXPENSES (FOREST).

X. *Forest—d.* (1) *Wood Preservation Plant—Working Expenses and Seigniorage.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'X. Forest—*d*. (1) Wood Preservation Plant—Working Expenses and Seigniorage'."

DEMAND No. 42.—WORKING EXPENSES—IRRIGATION WORKS—COMMERCIAL.

XVII I.N.E. & D. Works (*Commercial*) *Working Expenses.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 8,76,300 be granted to

the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'I.N.E. & D. Works (Commercial)—Working Expenses'."

DEMAND No. 47.—IRRIGATION—(NON-COMMERCIAL).

68-*A*. *Construction of I.N.E. & D. Works* (*Non-Commercial*).

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Construction of I.N.E. and D. Works—Non-Commercial'."

DEMAND No. 51.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL WORKS.

81. *Capital Account of Civil Works Outside the Revenue Account.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Capital Account of Civil Works outside the Revenue Account'."

DEMAND No. 57.—SCHEMES CONNECTED WITH STATE SCHEMES OF GOVERNMENT TRADING.

85-*A*. *Capital Outlay on State Schemes of Government Trading.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,01,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Schemes of State Trading'."

DEMAND No. 67 A.—APPROPRIATION TO THE CONTINGENCY FUND.

85-*B*. *Appropriation to the Contingency Fund.*

"That a further sum not exceeeding Rs. 1,00,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Appropriation to the Contingency Fund'."

DEMAND No. 58—LOANS AND ADVANCES

P. Loans and Advances by the State Government.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 50,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1958, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the State Government'."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday, the 18th March 1958.